CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.606
21 January 1992

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 21 January 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Naste Calovski (Yugoslavia)

GE.92-60093/4175B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 606th plenary meeting and the 1992 session of the Conference on Disarmament.

At the very beginning, I wish to recall that, during the intersessional period, we learnt the sad news of the passing away of Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal, former Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and Secretary-General of the Conference. Ambassador Jaipal had a distinguished career in the Foreign Service of India. He served his country in Moscow, Vienna and Belgrade. As representative of Yugoslavia, I should say that he earned our respect and admiration for his diplomatic skill and human values. He completed his diplomatic service as Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations. He became, between 1979 and 1984, the first Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and Secretary-General of this body. At the beginning of the Conference's work, he faced the heavy responsibility of advising it on delicate questions relating to all its organizational arrangements, as well as on substantive issues which the Conference had to address in a systematic way for the first time since the multilateral disarmament negotiating body was established in its present configuration in 1962. He contributed significantly in developing a number of practices and precedents which greatly helped the Conference to overcome times of deep political confrontation. He did so with knowledge of diplomatic practice and fairness for all views and positions. He also promoted, with his outstanding personal qualities, a climate of human relations among the members of the Conference, which transcended political differences and greatly helped the Conference to pass through such hazardous times.

It might be appropriate for me to recall that he played a substantial role in the consultations leading to the establishment, for the first time since the very opening of multilateral disarmament negotiations, of a subsidiary body open to all members to consider the all-important question of a nuclear test ban.

I wish to ask the representative of India, on behalf of the Conference, to transmit to his Government and to Mrs. Sheila Jaipal, as well as to the other members of the family, our deeply felt condolences on their loss, which is also felt not only in his own country but by all of us.

If no member wishes to take the floor at this stage, I should like to invite the Conference to pay tribute to Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal by observing a minute of silence.

* * *

I give the floor to the representative of India, Ambassador Shah.

Mr. SHAH (India): My delegation would like to express its gratitude to you and the Conference for the warm words of tribute bestowed upon late Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal, the first Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, who passed away at New Delhi in November 1991.

(Mr. Shah, India)

His tragic loss came as a great shock to all of us who had known him personally. He was not only one of the most brilliant and outstanding officers of the Indian Diplomatic Service but also a man of principles, of literary tastes and a cheerful and amiable disposition. In carrying out his professional tasks he had always maintained a fairness and respect for all views and positions.

Ambassador Jaipal had an envirable career. From his initial stint in Burma (now Myanmar) from January 1949 to May 1951, he moved on to serve at the Indian Mission in Trinidad till 1954. In 1954 he was a member of the delegation to the United Nations Trusteeship Council, served as the Indian representative on the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories in East Africa and later in 1958 as the member of the United Nations Mission to the Cameroons. His career then took him to the USSR where he was Deputy Chief of the Indian Mission from 1962 to 1967. He later served as India's Ambassador to Yugoslavia. From 1974 to 1979, he was India's Ambassador to the United Nations where he also represented India on the Security Council.

From June 1979 to December 1984 he held the rank of Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations and Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva. His contributions to the field of disarmament in general and to the Conference particularly are known to many who have worked in this field. His instrumental role in getting a working group established on a nuclear test ban was one of the many notable achievements during his stay in Geneva as Secretary-General of the Conference.

Ambassador Jaipal continued to associate himself with disarmament matters even after his retirement from active diplomatic life. He continued to work as a "think tank" on many important issues of international relations and on disarmament matters. He was a regular visitor to Geneva and lectured to the participants in the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme every year. He was on the Executive Board of a number of non-governmental organizations associated with disarmament and was a considered and acknowledged repository of knowledge in the disarmament field.

Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal was also an international author of repute in the field of international relations and disarmament and has a number of books to his credit. The last one, Memories of a Half Life, was, in many ways, the culmination of his efforts in the field of disarmament.

While the professional aspect of his life is known to everyone, what is not known are the poetic abilities of Ambassador Jaipal. A collection of his poems entitled Flowers of Grass bears testimony to the poet that was hidden inside him. It is in this book that he writes that at his last meeting of the Conference, he penned the following lines about disarmament negotiations:

(Mr. Shah, India)

"It's the same old bargaining in the market place,
Losing nothing, gaining something, saving face;
To count Pershings instead of blessings
Is taking too many risks with the human race.
Ask not for whom the bell tolls;
It tolls for the arms race that rolls
Forever forward
Never backward;
It tolls also for all living souls."

The loss of Ambassador Jaipal is irreparable. In him we have lost a great visionary in matters relating to disarmament and international relations but we will continue to derive inspiration from all that he said and achieved. Mr. President, I thank you and the Conference once again and would like to assure you that we shall convey the kind thoughts expressed on behalf of the CD and yourself to the bereaved family.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of India for his statement. We shall now process with our business for today.

As I am assuming today, as representative of Yugoslavia, the responsibility of presiding over this body, I wish to assure you of my close cooperation during the coming weeks. I shall be available to deal with any matter which members of the Conference might consider relevant to our work. At the same time, I am convinced that your help and advice will be of great assistance to me in organizing the activities of the Conference. Allow me also, on behalf of the Conference, to thank Ambassador Arteaga of Venezuela for his competence and diplomatic expertise in discharging his responsibilities as President of the Conference during the month of August and the intersessional period which has just ended.

I should like also to wish personal and professional success to the former representatives of Belgium and Mongolia who left us recently. I am happy to welcome their successors who have already been accredited to the Conference. I refer to Ambassadors Michel Servais of Belgium and Shirchinjavyn Yumjav of Mongolia, to whom I pledge our cooperation in the new assignments given to them by their Governments.

At this point, with your permission, as my opening statement, I would like to make the following observations on the questions before the Conference.

This year's session of the Conference on Disarmament is, without doubt, opening in a significantly changing manner. The cold war lid has been lifted, but the construction of a new balance has not yet been completed.

It is justified to be optimistic, since dialogue and partnership are taking the place of the confrontations and mistrust of the past decades. But there are no less uncertainties and disturbances in world relations today.

(The President)

What we can see is that the consolidation of democratic processes on national and international levels is a much more challenging task than many had thought it would be. The more so as there are no recipes prepared in advance. Democracy is much more than a simple transition from one state of affairs to another.

It is obvious that national and international priorities are changing at a speed sometimes difficult to follow, to control. We need to have serious studies of and solutions to the new security system in the light of contemporary developments and new realities. Thus, dealing with disarmament problems in this unique body for multilateral negotiations on disarmament gains in importance. Efforts at creating a new security balance by way of concrete negotiations and agreements on arms control and disarmament measures, as well as efforts aimed at levelling economic imbalances, represent priorities on today's world agenda.

This Conference should not be a place where only ongoing world changes shall merely be reflected. It has to offer its own contribution to the evolution of concepts on a new balance and, within that framework, to come up with legal and political conclusions to meet the needs of such a transformation. In this context, it is of the utmost importance that the Conference successfully anticipates future trends and events in this field. The members of this Conference will be successful, in this respect, only if they strictly uphold, respect and consistently apply international law.

The short-term and long-term (that is, strategic) interests of practically all participants are quite rapidly changing. Many of us, during this year's session, will not have the same approach to items on this Conference's agenda. Even the aims of disarmament measures will be viewed differently. I am convinced that, in this, we shall be more inventive. There will be many more views and our deliberations will be more enriching and hence more challenging. The procedure will perhaps be more complicated, as reaching a consensus will be a longer process, but consequently, the solutions will be durable and carry weight. We should do our utmost to harmonize those efforts for the interest of all. And this is why it is of paramount importance that we constantly ensure full transparency in the work of the Conference.

In all this, our main interest is that this Conference becomes an equal partner in the construction of a new security structure in the world, an independent partner but also part of the United Nations system that should grow into a fundamental instrument in the creation of the so-called new world order. Regardless of the multitude of responsibilities the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly will have in the construction of this new environment, this Conference cannot lag behind and should rid itself of certain criteria it adopted itself at some point in times gone by.

This means that we should also, among ourselves, create new relations of partnership. The times require respect for the interests of all, since then everyone takes on his own part of responsibility in the realization of the aims of this Conference.

(The President)

It is in this light that I see the priorities of our work. I think it will be exceptionally important that this year we wind up our work on the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons successfully. Nobody needs convincing that the initiatives for the control and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, chemical and nuclear in particular, are of top priority.

I am convinced that the Conference will give important consideration to all items on the agenda. We have to make further efforts to reduce nuclear danger, to prevent an arms race in outer space, to eliminate radiological weapons, to enhance the work on the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

It is certain that there exists a political will to bring to a close the negotiations on the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, but in order to stay to the point we have to make sure that the convention is of equal interest to all members of the Conference and the United Nations as a whole. In this regard we shall require much patience and wisdom, to review and respect the interests of others and adopt realistic solutions.

I am deeply convinced of the new potential of this Conference as a main contributor to the new security order. The interest expressed that new, very important issues - transparency in armaments among others - be set before this Conference shows that there is still much to be done. Together, with all the other questions I mentioned at the beginning, I wish to believe that we are rightfully expecting a very active session this year and each and every one's contribution to the success of this Conference. If we are to take such a stand, our Conference could decisively influence the global agenda on disarmament.

That concludes my opening statement.

I should like to inform you that the consultations I have been holding on some organizational matters have been successful in the case of a number of questions that we had to settle so that the Conference might begin work on substantive issues immediately. We shall be able today to take decisions on the agenda and programme of work for the 1992 session, in connection with which I will make a presidential statement, and the establishment of several subsidiary bodies on various items of the agenda. Once we have listened to the speakers listed to address the plenary this morning, I shall invite the Conference to hold a brief informal meeting to confirm the consensus which has emerged on those questions, and then we shall resume the plenary to take action on them. In the coming days I will continue to consult with the members on the other pending organizational matters, so that we can advance in the consideration of the substantive questions before us.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the groups on their efforts to settle as many questions as possible before the start of the CD. I would particularly like to thank the group coordinators, Ambassador Shah, Ambassador Solesby and Ambassador Tóth. At the same time, I would like to

(The President)

underline that my task was made easier because of the assistance and support of both Ambassadors Komatina and Berasategui, to whom I would like to express my thanks, hoping that we shall settle all pending questions very soon, and I would also like to thank very much my predecessor, Ambassador Arteaga.

I shall now invite the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ambassador Komatina, to take the floor in order to read out a message which has been addressed to us by the new Secretary-General, Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

Mr. KOMATINA (Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations): The message from the Secretary-General to the 1992 session of the Conference on Disarmament reads as follows:

"It gives me great pleasure to address my first message to the Conference on Disarmament as it opens its 1992 session. You are resuming your important work in an international environment significantly different from the situation which existed only one year ago. The world is no longer hamstrung by past divisions. The end of the cold war has opened up unprecedented opportunities for the international community to seek a new system of international relations in which the costly burden of arms accumulation is replaced by efforts to ensure the security of all nations - big and small - at substantially reduced levels of armaments and armed forces. The momentum created by such significant agreements as INF, CFE and START, as well as certain unilateral measures announced last fall by some nuclear-weapon States, must be preserved and carried even further.

"Though we are significantly freer from the threat of nuclear confrontation and are witnessing substantial reductions in conventional armaments in Europe, the tasks ahead of us are, however, not less demanding. The recent recourse to arms in various parts of the world has forcefully reminded us that in order to be fully effective the process of disarmament must be concerned not only with the reduction of existing arsenals but also with the prevention of their actual use. I believe that in order to meet the demands placed upon it the international community must both enhance its preparedness to anticipate new challenges and strengthen its capacity to respond efficiently to the remaining threats to international security. In doing so we must recognize that, in a global context, regional and bilateral initiatives should increasingly become components of multilateralism rather than its substitute.

(Mr. Komatina, Secretariat)

"As the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, the CD plays a pivotal political role in substantive negotiations on priority questions of disarmament. With the stereotypes of the cold war becoming things of the past, the Conference should not only reflect the changing international landscape, but also be instrumental in transforming approaches to disarmament negotiations. It should do so by generating new ideas and initiatives.

"The Conference is on the threshold of a major achievement of multilateral diplomacy, as it has now entered the final stage of the elaboration of a convention on chemical weapons. I am confident that the future chemical weapons convention will constitute a far-reaching security arrangement for effectively eliminating a barbaric and indiscriminate means of warfare, and act as a barrier to its possible future resurgence. I welcome the intensification of the negotiations on this issue and strongly urge the Conference to maintain the momentum and exert its utmost effort to achieve the goal it has set out for itself this year - a final agreement during the 1992 session.

"The progress achieved in bilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations is striking indeed. Yet further, more far-reaching efforts are needed to eliminate completely the nuclear danger. In these efforts, the Conference must be given the opportunity to fulfil its role as a negotiating forum.

"The time has arrived when the world realistically expects the nuclear Powers to reassess their need for nuclear testing. We are all keenly aware of the strong divergent perceptions that still persist on the timing of a nuclear test ban. I for one, however, strongly believe that a test ban is an indispensable step towards a world without nuclear weapons. I support the dialogue begun in the Conference on this issue and encourage it to continue to seek the achievement of this goal.

"The de-escalation of nuclear competition should make it possible for the Conference to make progress also towards finding a common approach to developing effective arrangements to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Recent accessions to the non-proliferation Treaty by a number of States, as well as the conclusion of various nuclear safeguard agreements with IAEA by others, are reassuring developments which make this task even more pressing. I also draw encouragement from the renewed interest of many States in making their respective regions completely free from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. These States deserve the full support of the international community in their endeavours.

"I am aware that as of this session the Conference on Disarmament will address yet another complex and highly crucial issue, that of the interrelated aspects of the excessive and destablizing accumulation of arms and the concomitant issue of military holdings and procurement

(Mr. Komatina, Secretariat)

through national production. The new mandate given to the United Nations to establish and maintain a Register of Conventional Arms might well provide the international community with an opportunity to create effective, reliable mechanisms for promoting military restraint, transparency and confidence-building as supportive measures in the pursuit of international security and the reduction of arms. The imput of the Conference will provide, I am sure, a valuable contribution to ensuring that we succeed in making this register universal and non-discriminatory.

"The opportunity to make decisive progress towards a more secure world has never been better and we should not fail to seize it fully. For the challenging tasks ahead of you I wish you all the utmost success in your endeavours."

Here ends the message from the Secretary-General.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for transmitting the message from Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali. I ask Ambassador Komatina to convey to the Secretary-General of the United Nations our appreciation for his important contribution to our work. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has also addressed to me a communication by which he transmitted the resolutions and decisions on disarmament adopted by the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly. The communication has been circulated in all official languages as document CD/1115.

I have on my list of speakers for this opening plenary meeting the representatives of Peru and Mexico. I now give the floor to the representative of Peru, Ambassador de Rivero.

Mr. de RIVERO (Peru) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, I am very pleased that you are presiding over the Conference of Disarmament. In that context I offer you my delegation's full cooperation towards the success of your endeavours. We are all convinced here that your talent and experience will guide our deliberations productively and also innovatively. I also join you in welcoming Ambassador Servais of Belgium to the Conference on Disarmament. Before I begin my statement I wish to extend my sincere condolences to the former observer delegation of Chile (as we have not yet admitted observers) on the passing away of the Ambassador of Chile in Geneva, Rodomiro Tomic. His death will leave a tremendous void for Latin American democracy and diplomacy.

On behalf of the delegations of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Venezuela and Peru, I am very pleased to introduce the Cartagena Declaration on Renunciation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, which was signed, at the initiative of the President of Peru, at the meeting of Andean Group presidents held in the city of Cartagena de Indias in Colombia on 4 December 1991. The Declaration is contained in document CD/1114, which has been circulated in all the official languages and was placed in your pigeon-holes this morning.

(Mr. de Rivero, Peru)

This is the first time in the history of disarmament that a populated geographical area of the planet has become a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, through the Declaration - it is important to emphasize to this Conference - the Andean countries, in the same Declaration, also expressed their determination to become unconditional original signatories of the convention on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. The Cartagena Declaration is the culmination of a combined effort, but it is also the start of a gradual process to regulate the acquisition and transfer of advanced weaponry and related technology and prevent the strategic destabilization of Latin America and the Caribbean.

This issue that I am now addressing forms part of a regional position put forward by Peru that I reported on to this Conference last year, and it is now prompting growing worldwide interest. International arms transfers, arms production and trade in dual-purpose technologies are a source of concern because of the regional instability that they generate. The Gulf conflict is the clearest example of a lack of control over arms transfers that benefited no one. Last year the General Assembly took a major step forward with resolutions 46/36 L and 46/36 H because it sets up a register of arms transfers and requests this Conference to address this matter as soon as possible this year.

In the past four years we have witnessed a sort of spectacular avalanche of political, economic and strategic changes. As a result of these changes we have entered a qualitatively new era in international relations, with a different cast, where strategic power is based less and less on military factors and increasingly on economic and technological factors. All of this has come about in the midst of a tremendous revolution in which the market economy system, in economic matters, and the system of representative democracy in the political arena, are being adopted everywhere. Undoubtedly the threats to world peace have diminished sharply. However, new situations of international instability have arisen. World peace is now possible, but the world is more unstable. There is a new concrete situation of instability that we might call "nuclear confusion". This nuclear confusion is characterized by an easing of central control of certain categories of nuclear weapons and also by uncertainty as to the destination of nuclear material and the possibilities of unlawful trade in enriched uranium and plutonium, as well as the possible dissemination of the know-how and technology involved in producing weapons of mass destruction or their components. And also by the possible provision of services by scientists for the development of weapons of mass destruction.

A further emerging factor that is linked to this "nuclear confusion" is the role that is now falling to the regions, as in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. It is of course pleasing to note the new active role of the regions in a context where the bipolarization of international relations has ended. It would be absurb in this context for this to pass unnoticed in the Conference on Disarmament, because if there is a conviction that the international order now taking shape impresses forcefully on us, it is the need to strengthen regional involvement within the Conference on Disarmament, as the main basis of progress towards overall disarmament.

(Mr. de Rivero, Peru)

The Conference on Disarmament cannot overlook or remain indifferent to this new international factor that I have described. We believe that if we sidestep new issues for our agenda and do not give the regional groups an active and important role in the Conference, this would be tantamount to embalming the Conference amid traditional topics and groupings that follow a ritual characteristic of the inertia that was brought about by the cold war.

We believe that the changes, the new situations of instability and the active role of the regions have de facto changed the agenda of this Conference and, also, in effect, highlighted the problem of regional imbalance in its membership. When in 1990 the Conference on Disarmament decided to conduct informal consultations on ways of enhancing its effectiveness and functioning, what it sought to do was secure the adoption of measures which, while not departing from the framework of paragraph 120 of the Final Document adopted by the first special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on disarmament, would allow this Conference to make certain changes so as to enhance its productivity. However, today basic changes in circumstances are taking place in the international context, and they have relegated the problem of productivity in this Conference to the background, given the imminent risk that the present might elude it. In such circumstances, to continue in our routine ways could be interpreted as bureaucratic.

My delegation is of the view that, without changing the agenda and programme of work for this year, the question of enhancing the effective functioning of the Conference could be addressed through the appointment of two special coordinators, one to foster informal consultations with a view to updating the agenda and the rules of procedure of the Conference, and the other to foster informal consultations on membership and the new structure of the regional groups. An aggiornamento to bring the Conference on Disarmament into line with the new international circumstances is essential and a task to which we must contribute. This year we must embark on the opening up of the Conference towards the future.

The Conference on Disarmament has the ineluctable responsibility to finalize this year the convention to eradicate all chemical weapons once and for all from the face of the Earth, thus ending a barren 15-year period during which the Conference on Disarmament did not produce any agreement. It is on the threshold of this deadline, which will determine the future of the Conference on Disarmament, that I venture to make three comments on the approach that should guide the negotiations so as to ensure that they are successful and that by the end of this year we have a convention banning chemical weapons.

My first thought relates to the scope of the prohibition and the intended beneficiary of protection under the convention. On this important aspect of the negotiations, there are some - guided no doubt by the best of intentions - who would like to exclude from the convention any gap, ambiguity or loophole that could give rise to possible forms of non-compliance that are not explicitly prohibited in the text. With the best intentions they seek a

(Mr. de Rivero, Peru)

perfect legal instrument. Of course, ideally we should set forth an absolute, perfect prohibition. However, since beings are not perfect, and nor are diplomats, there is no alternative but to achieve a complete prohibition, in the context of what is possible and necessary, so as to provide for regional and global security and confidence.

When we say that the provisions should fall within the context of what is possible and necessary, what we mean is that their scope can never go beyond what can qualitatively or quantitively be examined, certified and verified. There should be no doubt whatsoever as to the intended beneficiary of protection - human beings and, by extension, animals. Expanding the scope of protection to plants, even though the prohibition may be specifically restricted to use, would give rise to a series of collateral problems, such as the verification and implementation of article X, which refers to the threat of use, inter alia. The generic or unlimited inclusion, within the definition of chemical weapons, of those substances that do not fall within the classification of "supertoxic lethal" or "lethal" chemicals should be handled very cautiously, and it might perhaps be advisable, since the prohibition cannot be absolute and perfect, to give pride of place in the definition to the effects that occur, that is death, temporary disability or permanent injury. Only in so far as a toxic chemical specified in the convention produces these effects in human beings or animals may it be considered a chemical weapon.

My second thought on the chemical weapons negotiations relates to the problem arising from the destruction of the stockpiles, which according to declarations exceed 90,000 tons. The issue of converting chemicals to a form unsuitable for production of chemical weapons in facilities specifically designed and equipped for that purpose, as provided for in articles IV and V and their annexes, is currently being reconsidered in certain specialized sectors, in view of the difficulties being encountered by at least one of the chemical-weapon States in achieving the total destruction of its chemical stockpile within the stipulated 10-year time-frame. In my delegation's opinion it would be appropriate to re-examine the concept of destruction in the light of the observations and difficulties prompted by the 10-year time-frame. The experts state that starting up a facility to destroy chemical weapons, for example, could take between three, four or six years, including the initial feasibility study. We are all aware, moreover, that the destruction of chemical weapons is very costly, particularly because of the physical security and environmental protection measures involved. We are also aware that there may be alternative methods and technologies to neutralize chemical-weapon stockpiles completely. On the other hand, the 10-year time-frame could be retained, provided that we are all convinced that this is a genuine, feasible time-frame that would be enough for carrying out the destruction or possible neutralization of chemical weapons, and that this will not lead to undue haste or pressure that might endanger the environment.

(Mr. de Rivero, Peru)

My third and final thought relates to the problem of challenge inspections. Working paper 371 of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons to a large extent summarizes the present status of the negotiations. However, unfortunately some still wish to some extent to distort the basic component in the original proposal to carry out such inspections in any place, at any time, and without delay. As far as my delegation is concerned, challenge inspection would be the last resort provided for under the convention in extreme cases when the other mechanisms available prove inadequate to resolve or clarify any doubt that arises from compliance with obligations under the convention. It is therefore important to emphasize and reiterate the exceptional or extreme nature of challenge inspection, because it is only in this fashion that we can understand the discretionary powers that should be conferred on the inspection team. My delegation therefore considers it questionable that the "final" perimeter of the site where the inspection is to be conducted may, in the final analysis, be the perimeter proposed by the inspecting State. It can also distort a challenge inspection if the inspected State is authorized to select alternative measures other than full and broad access for the inspectors.

If we bear in mind a recent case which has given rise to concern in the international community, we must agree that if we accept challenge inspections with ambiguities or restrictions, they will simply lose all justification. In this way we will be losing one of the most intelligent and appropriate mechanisms for ensuring confidence in compliance with the obligations and resolving doubts and questions that any convention, however perfect we may wish it to be, may have.

Before concluding, I would like to highlight once again the importance that my delegation attaches to agenda item 1 of this Conference, a complete nuclear test ban. Last year, the Ad Hoc Committee was able to conduct more exhaustive work, thus complementing the work done in 1990. However, it cannot continue indefintely to follow a methodology which excludes the negotiation of a comprehensive treaty that would ban tests once and for all. The major historical changes that I have referred to this morning, as well as the nature of the new threats and cases of instability facing the world and the regions, compel this Conference to move forward towards the negotiation of a comprehensive treaty on a complete nuclear test ban. No argument can serve to justify delay. This year, the Conference must take a further step towards giving concrete form to that goal, which is shared by the majority of mankind.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Peru for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Marín Bosch.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, please accept the warm congratulations of the delegation of Mexico as you take up the presidency of this Conference. In the year you have spent in Geneva you have distinguished yourself by your pleasant manner and your professionalism, qualities that will ensure the success of your term in this

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

initial stage of our work. We should like to put on record our appreciation for the way in which Ambassador Horacio Arteaga performed his duties as President, as well as the contribution made by the other members of the Venezuelan delegation. We sincerely regret the passing away of Ambassador Radomiro Tomic, a distinguished Chilean and an outstanding Latin American who ardently defended the universal values of peace and justice. We also endorse your words in paying tribute to the memory of Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal, a good friend of this Conference and a good friend of the United Nations.

We listened carefully to the first message the new Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, has addressed to this Conference. We welcome his commitment to the cause of disarmament and his comments on the role of this Conference and the priority issues on its agenda. For the first time in a decade, Ambassador Maj Britt Theorin is not attending the opening session of the CD. We shall miss her enthusiasm and knowledge of disarmament matters. We cordially welcome our dear friends, Ambassadors Komatina and Berasategui, and our new collegue from Belgium, Ambasador Michel Servais. We wish his predecessor, Ambassador Marcel Houllez, all the best. We should also like to welcome the delegation of the Russian Federation.

The world of January 1992 is a very different world from that of just a few years ago, when a chain of events was set in motion which, at the end of last month, culminated in the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The social and economic cost of these changes is impossible to assess, and the risks involved in the political dismantling of one of the two military super-Powers are a source of widespread concern. From one day to the next, the number of nuclear-weapon States has risen from five to eight. From one day to the next, the bilateral nuclear disarmament process agreed to in 1991 has been rendered more complicated, and despite the declared intention of the newly independent States to rid themselves of those weapons, the problems raised by their reduction and eventual elimination have multiplied. How are the provisions of a treaty negotiated bilaterally to be implemented when now there are at least five countries directly involved? The problem does not appear to have an arithmetical solution, since the sum of the parts of what was the USSR no longer adds up to the whole.

The year 1992 will be a watershed for Europe as was the year 1492. Today, as 500 years ago, we are witnessing an internal readjustment in Europe and a redefinition of its relationship with the rest of the world. As occurred half a millenium ago, there are Europeans who act as if the rest of the world did not exist, and there are others who seek new horizons. Today, as 500 years ago, we are living in a time of threats but also of promises. In the economic field, the assuredness with which the Twelve were pursuing the path towards greater integration has been affected by the inevitable enlargement of the Community, with its concomitant advantages and problems. In the social field, tensions have reappeared between European and

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

non-European populations, whose saddest manifestations have been outbreaks of xenophobia. In the political field, the disappearance of the socialist camp from Europe has blurred idealogical differences, and a greater uniformity of thought can already be glimpsed. With the disappearance of the Warsaw Pact, the members of NATO are scrambling to redefine their military strategies. Some have already begun to cut their armies and military budgets with a view to moving from armies and weapons designed to defend them from a possible attack on their own territory to rapid deployment forces. This was one of the lessons of the Gulf war.

The changes in the international climate have also been felt in multilateral forums. As early as 1989 some countries began to change their position on certain fundamental issues. But it was the action taken by the Security Council in the case of Iraq that made it evident how much the world balance has shifted. During the recent session of the General Assembly there was tangible proof of this. To begin with, the 280 resolutions adopted by the Assembly in 1991 reflect a reduction of virtually 20 per cent with regard to 1990 to a total that had not been recorded in 15 years. And of those 280 resolutions, almost 80 per cent were adopted, as in 1990, without objection, that is, with no negative votes. It had been years since anything similar had occurred in the Assembly.

With regard to the disarmament items, the 38 resolutions adopted marked the lowest figure since the 1970s. I should point out, however, that 17 of those resolutions (45 per cent) were put to a vote. Among them are several of special interest to the CD. The most important is resolution 46/38 C, on the role of this "single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum". In it the Assembly reiterates that in the present international climate it is more than ever imperative to give additional impetus to negotiations on disarmament at all levels. Thus, after welcoming the progress in the negotiations on the draft convention on the elimination of chemical weapons, the General Assembly again urged the CD to intensify its work on all the items on its agenda through substantive negotiations within the framework of the ad hoc committees. Resolution 46/38 C was adopted by 131 votes in favour, 8 against and 23 abstentions. Four countries were absent. Nine members of this Conference abstained and seven voted against. In explaining their negative vote, some pointed out that, since the CD works by consensus, the Assembly's resolutions regarding its work should also be approved by consensus. Some of those same delegations co-sponsored the text on the establishment of an arms register, contained in resolution 46/36 L, which, incidentally, was also put to a vote. In it the Assembly assigned a further task to this Conference when it requested it "to address, as soon as possible, the question of the interrelated aspects of the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms, including military holdings and procurement through national production, and to elaborate universal and non-discriminatory practical means to increase openness and transparency in this field". It further requested the CD "to address the problems of, and the elaboration of practical means to increase, openness and transparency related to the transfer of high technology with military applications and to weapons of mass destruction, in accordance with

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

with existing legal instruments". The General Assembly invited the Secretary-General to provide to the CD "all relevant information". Finally, the resolution requested the CD to include in its annual report to the Assembly a report on its work on this issue.

It is obvious that we will have to find an appropriate mechanism to study or address "as soon as possible" this item which will appear on the agenda of the next Assembly, under the title of "Transparency in armaments". This is an important issue whose consideration we have supported since the Government of Japan first suggested it in May of last year. However, we should avoid sterile procedural discussions about how and when we will take up the subject. It should be remembered that since 1 January this year a universal and non-discriminatory Register of Conventional Arms has been established at United Nations headquarters in New York. During this year the Register is to include data provided by States in accordance with the procedures and requirements regarding information, which will initially comprise those set out in the annex to resolution 46/36 L. The Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of governmental technical experts nominated by him, will have to elaborate the technical procedures and make any adjustments to the annex I have already referred to for the effective operation of the Register. He will also have to prepare a report on the "modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production". Moreover, Member States will be required to submit their views on the various aspects of the Register by 30 April 1994, the year in which another group of technical experts will be established to study the operation and "further development" of the Register. Hence this is a Register that will have several stages, and an effort to be pursued along various lines. Ours, here in Geneva, is but one of them.

What already exists - and this is something that we must bear very much in mind - is a Register of Conventional Arms which for the time being covers only data on the transfer of such arms. No register was established to include, as of now, the production of conventional weapons, or weapons of mass destruction, as many of us suggested during the last General Assembly. We nurture the hope that the main sponsors of the resolution, which include some of the world's major arms suppliers, will be the first to provide the United Nations with the data necessary to ensure the smooth operation of the Register. They will thus be practising what they preach and in this way they will encourage other States to fulfil their obligations so that we can refine an information system that, over time, can build confidence and strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

During the last General Assembly it also proved possible to merge the two texts which for many years had been adopted in parallel on the question of a comprehensive nuclear test ban. The new text is contained in resolution 46/29, adopted by a vote of 147 for and 2 against, with 4 abstentions and 13 delegations absent. That vote reflects the firm position of the overwhelming majority of the international community in favour of

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

putting an end to all nuclear testing once and for all. In this so-called "new world" nuclear weapons have no justification, if ever they had one. Furthermore, as was pointed out a year ago by Gerard C. Smith, a former Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency of the United States, "it is difficult to conceive of any single measure that would do more to stem the spread of the nuclear scourge than a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing". That quotation is taken from Arms Control Today, November 1990. Ambassador Smith is not the first senior official of a nuclear-weapon State whose opinion on nuclear testing changed after he left Government service. At a recent seminar held in Princeton, New Jersey, we noticed that something similar is happening in the scientific community, especially among those atomic physicists involved in nuclear testing programmes who, once retired, give up trying to justify such tests and instead work for a ban.

Mexico continues to advocate the prompt conclusion of a treaty that will ban all nuclear tests. Together with other countries we have proposed an amendment to the partial test-ban Treaty in order to convert it into a CTBT. That process will continue this year with a series of consultations to be conducted by the President of the Amendment Conference, Foreign Minister Ali Alatas of Indonesia. But that should not serve as an excuse for the CD to continue dodging this priority issue. Two years ago, as a result of the flexibility of the majority of its members, the CD re-established the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, but without a negotiating mandate. In spite of this, the Committee's work was useful, though we consider that in 1992 it will be difficult to improve on what we have already achieved in the discussions of 1990 and 1991 under the leadership of Ambassadors Donawaki and Chadha respectively. We should now move from discussions to the negotiation of the provisions of a CTBT.

Once again a large part of the CD's time and efforts will be spent on the negotiation of a convention on the total prohibition of chemical weapons. Since last year important changes have been made in the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons: in February the qualification that prevented it from proceeding to the finalization of a draft convention was dropped, and in June, besides the call to intensify negotiations "with a view to striving to achieve a final agreement on the convention by 1992", the prohibition of use was included in the title of the future convention. Those changes have begun to bear fruit. This is reflected in the report that we submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, which in its resolution 46/35 C urges the CD, as a matter of the highest priority, to resolve outstanding issues so as to achieve a final agreement during the present session.

The work done by the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons during the intersessional period is further proof of the commitment we all have to strive to achieve an agreement during 1992. However, bearing in mind the many implications of the series of outstanding issues, it is advisable to avoid setting deadlines which later we may not be able to keep. The example of the Uruguay Round of negotiations in GATT could serve as a precedent. That does not imply that we should reduce the pace of the Committee's work, but rather

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

that time should be given to assess carefully the effects of each and every one of the provisions which will be included in the future convention, so that it can be applied on a truly universal scale.

One year ago, referring to the question of the enlargement of the CD, my delegation reviewed in detail the evolution of the composition of this disarmament negotiating forum. We think that it would be useful if we could discuss that and other matters of general interest in an appropriate format. The CD's procedures, as we have said before, are too formal and formalistic. It is obvious that a few alterations in our modus operandi will not change our modus vivendi. But we do think it would be useful to explore some different paths, since the inertia of our old habits is at times our worst enemy. It would perhaps be advantageous for all if we had an informal forum to air many of the questions which hamper or complicate our work and which can now only be dealt with in the presidential consultations on Wednesdays, in the slow process of talks within and among the various groups, or, even worse, in the time-consuming machinery of bilateral contacts. Of course, social occasions sometimes offer an opportunity to raise some subjects, but they cannot be a substitute for a fixed meeting place. And this is the background to the following suggestion: that the current President or the Secretary-General of the CD should periodically convene the heads of delegation to discuss - without papers, without summary records and without interpreters - matters that are considered to be of general interest. This is a procedural suggestion. Now in conclusion I shall venture to make a substantive one. We are all aware that the subject of the relationship between this Conference and the world outside this room has been a leitmotiv of our debates. Over the past few years the Conference on Disarmament has heard a number of statements in plenary regarding various aspects of the question of non-proliferation of weapons and weapon systems, especially nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. Yet the CD has still not managed to address these matters in a proper format. It is proposed that, without prejudice to its formal agenda, the CD should consider in 1992 the whole range of issues related to these matters. To that end an informed open-ended group could be established. No aspect of the subject would be excluded, and the groups informal character would allow us the opportunity of identifying questions that the Conference could examine more closely and, if that should be agreed, more formally. Since it would be an informal group, there would be no need to restate known positions on the subject, nor would it necessarily have to report to anyone on its work and results. Perhaps you, Mr. President, might seek the views of the other members of the Conference on this proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Mexico for his statement and for the kind words that he addressed to me. That concludes my list of speakers. Does any other member wish to take the floor at this stage? I see none.

(The President)

As announced at the opening of this plenary meeting, I will now convene an informal meeting of the Conference to consider the agenda and programme of work for the 1992 session and the question of the re-establishment of some subsidiary bodies.

The plenary meeting was suspended at 11.40 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 606th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed. I now wish to invite the Conference to formalize the agreements reached at the informal meeting we have just held. The relevant draft decisions are contained in documents CD/WP.416 to 419.

I now put before the Conference for adoption document CD/WP.416, containing the draft provisional agenda and programme of work for the annual session of the Conference. If there is no objection, I shall consider that the Conference adopts the draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: In connection with the decision that we have just taken, I wish to make the following statement for the record:

"In taking into account the recommendations made to it by the General Assembly, in accordance with rule 27 of the rules of procedure, the Conference notes the importance of the subject dealt with by General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, entitled 'Transparency in armaments', and the request made to it by the General Assembly 'to address, as soon as possible, the question of the interrelated aspects of the excessive and destabilising accumulation of arms, including military holdings and procurement through national production, and to elaborate universal and non-discriminatory practical means to increase openness and transparency in this field', 'to address the problems of, and the elaboration of practical means to increase, openness and transparency related to the transfer of high technology with military applications and to weapons of mass destruction, in accordance with existing legal instruments', and 'to include in its annual report to the General Assembly a report on its work on this issue'. The Conference also notes that it can decide at any time to include a new item on the agenda, and that further consultations are needed in order to achieve consensus on the best modalities to address the subject-matter. I shall report to the Conference on the results of such consultations as they proceed.

"As regards the programme of work for the 1992 session, it is understood that the dates indicated for the three parts of the annual session do not prejudge any decision that the Conference may wish to adopt, should this be necessary, on additional work during the break between the first and second parts, as well as between the second and third parts of the session. It is also clear that if, for any reason relating to our work, we were to adjust these dates during 1992, we could do so at any time during the session."

(The President)

I shall now proceed to document CD/WP.417, by which the Conference will re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons and appoint as its Chairman Ambassador Adolf Ritter von Wagner of Germany. I see no objection to the draft decision, and we shall therefore adopt it.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I am pleased to note that, by this quick decision at the opening of our work for 1992, the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons is now in a position to resume work immediately, in order to intensify its negotiations this year on a final agreement on a convention banning chemical weapons. Allow me also, on behalf of the Conference, to extend our congratulations to Ambassador von Wagner on his appointment to the heavy responsibility of conducting the work of the Ad Hoc Committee at this crucial stage of its work. His knowledge of the subject-matter and his diplomatic competence will, I am sure, provide the necessary impetus for these negotiations. I give the floor to Ambassador von Wagner.

Mr. von WAGNER (Germany): Mr. President, let me express my delegation's deep satisfaction at having the privilege to negotiate world-wide arms control and disarmament questions under your able guidance. We wish you luck and success.

The Conference on Disarmament has just decided on the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I feel very honoured that the Conference entrusted me with the task of chairing the Ad Hoc Committee. I should like to express my sincere thanks to all my colleagues for their confidence in my efforts. I feel very honoured and grateful - but above all, I feel obliged by the responsibility which accompanies the Ad Hoc Committee chairmanship in this critical year. You have my firm commitment that I will do everything to bring our common endeavour to a successful conclusion.

In this context, and here I should like to add to my prepared manuscript, I want to stress that I am perfectly aware that I need your trustworthy cooperation. I shall undertake concrete efforts to maintain close contact with all groups and delegations, and I shall consult with them as closely as possible in order to achieve smooth proceedings in the more formal meetings and sessions. At the same time, I should like to invite and encourage all delegates also to seek close contact with me; the cooperation I envisage cannot be a one-way street. Efforts, however, from all sides will achieve success.

The convention is clearly within reach this year, thanks to the contributions by all delegations and by the previous chairmen of the Ad Hoc Committee. I should like to pay tribute in particular to my predecessor, Ambassador Batsanov, who led the work of the Committee in a very skilful and pragmatic way. Due to the untiring efforts under particularly difficult circumstances by Ambassador Batsanov, his working group chairmen and Friends of the Chair, we now have the basis on which we can venture the last breakthrough to the signing of the convention.

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

As we resume our negotiations on finalizing the global ban on chemical weapons, it may be useful to recall our basic negotiating objectives so as to put the remaining problems into perspective. First of all, we have the objective to rid the world of chemical weapons in order to achieve a gain in security for all of us. It has long been recognized that chemical weapons are a particularly cruel and repugnant means of warfare. One year ago, history gave us a lesson that should also have removed any lingering doubts about the role of chemical weapons in international security. If their existence continues to be legitimate, they pose a grave threat to international peace and security. The Gulf war and its antecedents have confirmed two conclusions. Firstly, despite their limited military utility, chemical weapons do have very harmful political properties. In the hands of unscrupulous aggressors, they can foster political and military adventurism. Secondly, non-proliferation efforts through export controls are insufficient to control the danger that chemical weapons constitute for the international community. The best non-proliferation measure is an effective chemical weapons ban that is based on global cooperative efforts.

Looking at these conclusions, one might wonder why it seems so difficult to bring the Geneva negotiations to a close. The security benefits which a global ban on chemical weapons would bring about seem too obvious to allow of any hesitation. Such security benefits would accrue to all countries, although national perceptions sometimes might differ. Some countries might have a particular interest in the chemical weapons convention. A Chinese scholar in the Chemical Defence Research Institute in Beijing observed last year:

> "... developing countries face a more dangerous threat from chemical weapons than do developed countries. It is not surprising that all the uses of chemical weapons after World War I were against developing countries."

The quotation continues:

> "... the statement 'Chemical weapons are the poor man's nuclear bomb' is wrong. The right statement is 'Chemical weapons are the sword of Damocles hanging over the poor man's head'."

The immediate security benefits which would flow from a global ban on chemical weapons already provide a compelling reason for strongly urging the Conference on Disarmament to conclude negotiations in Geneva. But there are further compelling reasons - reasons going beyond chemical weapons. Concluding the CWC successfully offers us the chance to inaugurate a qualitatively new era for multilateral arms control and disarmament. It is very difficult to maintain the momentum of a complex, long-term endeavour like multilateral arms control without any visible, tangible results. Success in this field requires treaties. The Conference on Disarmament in its present form has not produced one single international treaty text. The environmental modification Convention of 18 May 1977 was the last achievement of

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

multilateral arms control to this date. Whereas - in the years just passed - disarmament treaties between the former cold war opponents have proliferated, arms control on a global scale seems to have come to a standstill.

This not too rosy picture would change dramatically if we finally came to terms with the few remaining issues of the chemical weapons convention. The convention would provide invaluable fresh impetus for the endeavour of multilateral arms control. The liberation of mankind from the threat of chemical weapons would have positive implications going far beyond the negotiating matter.

In addition to the direct security benefits, States parties to the convention would discover a completely new experience in applying an unprecedented body of provisions for global disarmament and verification. Experience in applying the instruments of the convention would help us to understand that reliable disarmament does not imply risk, but opportunity; not a danger to national sovereignty, but a singular opportunity to build on the foundation of a new, cooperative concept of international security.

The world needs such a new, cooperative security concept. We all know the global challenges of our time, which have united us into one large "community for survival". We have seen the fading away of the old East-West conflict, we witness the transformation into the vision of a zone of peaceful cooperation stretching from North America over the Atlantic Ocean and Europe to the Pacific. In this process, the cooperative instruments of confidence-building, arms control and disarmament have played a key role. It is true that these instruments cannot be utilized independently from overall political conditions. But it is also true that without such cooperative instruments tension and confrontation cannot be transformed into common efforts of building peace.

Looking at the remaining negotiating problems of the chemical weapons convention in this broader context, their relative significance, having been put into perspective, should have become clearer. The remaining obstacles must be surmountable, although they reflect serious questions like verification, trade issues, cooperation and old chemical weapons. Having a vision of the larger issues at stake, we will overcome these obstacles.

The success of the chemical weapons convention will depend largely on its universal acceptance. You, Mr. President, rightly pointed to this important feature in your opening statement. In this respect, the already large number of countries which have pledged early signature is very encouraging, and the Cartagena Declaration, which was introduced to the CD by Ambassador de Rivero of Peru is an additional pledge of the highest importance to this effect. Furthermore, all delegations in Geneva have clearly pronounced their strong interest in the success of the convention. The attractiveness of the convention will also play a key role with regard to universality. But more will be needed, in particular demonstrations of responsibility on the regional level. In some regions, long-standing political conflict might seem to require prior solution before accession to the chemical weapons convention is

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

considered. However, there could be a fallacy in such thinking: as I have indicated before, arms control treaties are not only luxury items that follow peace; they are vital instruments in bringing about and strengthening peace.

We know that our negotiations have reached a watershed. The final breakthrough is in sight. The United Nations General Assembly, in its resolution 46/35 C, strongly urged the Conference on Disarmament, "as a matter of the highest priority, to resolve in the forthcoming months outstanding issues so as to achieve a final agreement during its 1992 session". If the Conference on Disarmament failed to live up to this task, the consequences for the global arms control dialogue might be grave - as the positive ramifications of success would go beyond chemical disarmament.

The time has come for a global ban on chemical weapons. After long periods of contentious debate and stagnation, we face a singular opportunity. Let us grasp it so that, during the months to come, we may adopt by consensus the text of the chemical weapons convention.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador von Wagner for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. We shall now turn to document CD/WP.418, concerning the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-nuclear-weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I propose now that we turn to document CD/WP.419, containing a draft decision on the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons. Shall I also consider that the Conference adopts the draft decision?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: In connection with agenda item 7, "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems o25such weapons", it would be appropriate for us to keep in mind that, whenever it is appropriate for the Conference to deal with this agenda item and in the light of its existing priorities, it should keep under review, with expert assistance, as appropriate, the prohibition of the development and manufacture of those weapons and systems with a view to making, when necessary, recommendations on undertaking specific negotiations on the identified types of such weapons.

I should like now to refer to the question of further measures for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed. As you know, we must report to the General Assembly on this matter at the end of the 1992 session. During our informal consultations, it was agreed that in order to consider this subject, we would hold informal meetings later in the annual session.

At this point I would like to give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation, and after that to the representative of Belgium.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (translated from Russian): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on taking up this very important post at our Conference and to wish you every success in your very difficult work. I have taken the floor at this time as the outgoing Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, even though in a week I will of course be performing my last function, which is to present the report on our work last year. But I have taken the floor in order to congratulate Ambassador von Wagner very sincerely on taking over from me at this time, and to express my full conviction that under his leadership - I do not wish to dwell on his qualities, with which we are all familiar - we will achieve final success, by succeeding in finalizing the draft convention on chemical weapons.

The PRESIDENT: I thank you for your statement and for the kind words addressed to me. The Ambassador of Belgium has the floor.

Mr. SERVAIS (Belgium) (translated from French): Mr. President, I would not wish to let this meeting end without expressing a word of thanks for the messages of welcome and encouragement which you and our colleagues from Peru and Mexico have expressed. I also thank my Mexican colleague for the wishes he expressed concerning my predecessor, Ambassador Marcel Houllez. I will not fail to convey those greetings to him. I would simply like to tell you, Mr. President, that you can rely on my full support and that of my delegation in the delicate tasks that yourself and the members of the general secretariat of the Conference will have to address in the days and weeks to come.

The PRESIDENT: I thank you for your statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I will now give the floor to the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ambassador Komatina, for a statement on the services which will be available to the Conference during the 1992 session.

Mr. KOMATINA (Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations): In view of existing financial constraints, we are mandated by the General Assembly to report to the Conference on the services to be assigned to it during the 1992 session. As in previous sessions, the Conference will be allocated 10 meetings per week with full servicing, and 15 meetings per week with full services during the sessions of the Seismic Group. In other words, we should be able to hold two daily meetings with full servicing throughout the whole of the 1992 session, plus one additional daily meeting when the Seismic Group is in session.

The secretariat has informed the Department of Conference Services of the importance of making provision for additional servicing for the negotiations on chemical weapons, should this become necessary. Of course, it is understood that, in order to ensure such additional services, the actual utilization of the 10 weekly meetings normally assigned to the Conference will be taken into account.

(Mr. Komatina, Secretariat)

As stated by you, Mr. President, and by your predecessor in connection with the programme of work for the annual session, the secretariat has also requested the Department of Conference Services to note that negotiations on chemical weapons may have to continue during the recesses between the first and second parts of the session, as well as between the second and third parts. Requirements during those periods have been estimated at three or four weekly meetings with full services, to be held on the days on which the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons regularly meets.

As the work of the Conference proceeds, it may be necessary to hold meetings of subsidiary bodies consecutively with other committees or working groups. This practice has in the past prevented the waste of allocated resources in the event of early adjournment of meetings. In this respect, punctuality in starting meetings of the Conference is also important. I wish to inform you that we are not using all the services assigned to us. In 1991 the Conference and its subsidiary bodies lost a total of 322 hours of full services. It is also understood that meetings with such services cannot be held in the evening or during weekends.

I also wish to recall that measures accepted by the Conference at the informal meeting held on 22 April 1986 concerning savings in documentation continue to be valid. In order to implement these decisions, all papers need to be presented well in advance.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General for his statement. You will recall that the points raised today by Ambassador Komatina were taken up by me during our informal consultations, and no objections were raised to the arrangements that he has announced. So the Conference will therefore proceed accordingly.

I have no other business for today, but before I adjourn this plenary meeting I would like to inform you that in the light of the new seating arrangements being followed this year, the secretariat will re-issue document CD/8/Rev.4 with the corresponding change in annex I containing the list of member States. This will also be useful to all of us, since the secretariat informs me that the present document is practically out of print.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 23 January, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.607
23 January 1992

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 23 January 1992, at 10.a.m.

President: Mr. Naste Calovski (Yugoslavia)

GE.92-60174/8475a

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 607th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

I am informed by the secretariat that no delegation is listed to speak today. In accordance with the practice of the Conference, however, I should like to ask whether any member wishes to speak at this stage. I see none.

Obviously, we will be adjourning very early today, but I hope that we can put the time available this morning to good use for some informal consultations which might help us to advance our work. As you know, we still need to achieve consensus on organizational arrangements for some agenda items. We also need to provide chairmen for two subsidiary bodies already established, and we might also need to appoint others for ad hoc committees if, as I expect, we establish other subsidiary bodies. There is also the question of "Transparency of armaments", on which I have to consult, as I noted in my presidential statement on Tuesday. While I am responsible for such consultations, I do hope that members will also engage in informal contacts to assist me in discharging this responsibility.

The question is also pending of participation of States not members of the Conference in our work. There are already 38 requests before the Conference, and I hope that we will be able to take them up at the plenary meeting next Tuesday. I should also like to note that the speakers at our opening plenary meeting advanced ideas and suggestions which will require consultations. I therefore invite you to keep these comments in mind after I adjourn the plenary meeting and to use the time made available by the lack of speakers to assist me in advancing our work concerning organizational arrangements.

The two small conference rooms attached to the Council Chamber are available for any delegations wishing to conduct consultations. I am informed that the East European Group will meet in room C.108 directly after this plenary meeting.

For the time being, I will not circulate the weekly timetable of meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies, since only the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons is in a position to start substantive work. I shall do so once we have other ad hoc committees aready to commence their activities.

At the request of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, I wish to inform you that the first meeting of that subsidiary body will be held tomorrow, Friday, at 10 a.m., in this conference room.

I have no other business for today, and I shall now adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 28 January, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 10.25 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.608
28 January 1992

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 28 January 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Naste Calovski (Yugoslavia)

GE.92-60180/8503a

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 608th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

As was the case last Thursday, no delegation has been inscribed to take the floor at this plenary meeting. However, following our practice, I wish to ask whether any member wishes to speak at this stage? I see none.

I had hoped today to be in a position to put before the Conference, for decision, the 38 requests from States not members of the Conference to participate in its work. This is what I understood from those delegations that were still consulting among themselves when I approached them last week. However, we are not in a position to take action today. The consultations among some members of delegations are still continuing. The 38 requests which were to be taken up today already reflect a record number of non-members interested in our work. We shall now have to wait for a decision, which I expect will be forthcoming this week. I urge those members who need more time to consult, to do so actively, so that we will not have to postpone a decision which we owe to those interested in joining us at an important stage of our work. Suffice it to say that all 38 requests refer to the negotiations on the draft convention banning all chemical weapons.

As we shall have time this morning to consult informally, I do hope that members will do so, not only on organizational and substantive questions before the Conference, but also on this important matter of participation by non-members in the work of the Conference.

I give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Batsanov.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (translated from Russian): Thank you, Mr. President. I am taking the liberty of making a brief remark on what happened at our last, and now our present, meeting. We have no speakers.

At one stage, we agreed that at certain periods of our work we would hold two meetings a week and, the rest of the time, one plenary meeting a week.

Well, if this practice, so to speak, continues - and indeed in any case - there is reason to revert to the question of how many plenary meetings we are to hold, perhaps by compressing the periods during which we planned to hold two plenary meetings a week.

Of course, I am not proposing settling this question now but I just wanted to flash a signal, so to speak.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Batsanov for his statement and for his suggestions, which I also think are relevant, and we should take them into account in our future way of organizing ourselves and in our deliberations. I thank you.

(The President)

I now give the floor to the representative of Germany, Ambassador von Wagner.

Mr. VON WAGNER (Germany): Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the situation for those delegations which have in the past observed our deliberations and have had the opportunity to participate in, at least the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, is of course particularly unsatisfactory. In previous years, Mr. President, all ad hoc committees set up by the Conference needed a certain time to get started. Last year, if my recollection is correct, it took about three to four weeks until the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons got started. This year we are happy to record that the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons got started right away. There is the question of the admittance of observers, which is not delayed but takes more time and I accept that of course fully.

Nevertheless, the situation for the observers is, as I have said, very unsatisfactory. I have not very thoroughly consulted with the Secretariat so far whether there are ways and means of helping; I do not see any, I must confess. Nevertheless, I could promise those who are not yet observers but are participating in this public meeting today to see whether there are any ways and means, but my hope is not very great. I would wish to let them know that at least the Ad Hoc Committee Chairman deplores this delay, for which he is not responsible.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Germany for his statement. Does any other member wish to take the floor? I see none.

I have no other business today and I shall proceed to adjourn this plenary meeting.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 30 January, at 10 a.m. The plenary meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 10.30 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.609
30 January 1992

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND NINTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 30 January 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Naste Calovski (Yugoslavia)

GE.92-60187/8494a

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 609th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

I have learnt that Ambassador Maj Britt Theorin, of Sweden, who had become the Dean of the representatives to the Conference, has now left her position as Leader of the Delegation of Sweden to this body. Ambassador Theorin served in that capacity since 27 January 1983 and chaired the Conference in June 1984. I should also mention that she chaired the Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General on a Comprehensive Study on Nuclear Weapons and participated actively in other important disarmament meetings. Her contributions to our work are well known and I hope that she will, in one form or another, continue to be associated with disarmament, where her competence, knowledge and personal qualities will always be welcome. I wish to ask the representative of Sweden to transmit to Ambassador Theorin our best wishes for her future career.

There is only one speaker on my list today, the representative of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Batsanov, to whom I now give the floor.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (translated from Russian): Thank you, Mr. President. Last time I expressed some views regarding the fact that our meetings are taking place largely without statements, so I myself have attempted to improve the situation somewhat.

In the course of my previous remarks, Mr. President, I already congratulated you on assuming your present post and I am certain that your high professional qualities as a diplomat will further the success of our work here. Allow me also to express the gratitude of my delegation to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Venezuela, Horacio Arteaga for the contribution he made to the work of the Conference on Disarmament when he was President.

I should also like to welcome the new Ambassador of Belgium, Mr. Michel Servais, and to assure him that our delegation is prepared to cooperate most productively with him. Mr. Ambassador, I also request you to convey the warmest words of gratitude and best wishes to your predecessor and my friend, Ambassador Houllez. I should also like to wish all the best to Ambassador Maj Britt Theorin, who has left the post of head of the delegation of Sweden to the Conference on Disarmament, and I ask the Swedish delegation also to convey these words to her.

Mr. President, today our delegation has taken the floor to inform the members of the Conference of a number of important decisions adopted lately by the Russian Government in the field of arms limitation and reduction. These decisions are set out in the statement by the President of Russia, Boris Yeltsin, of 29 January 1992. They have been prepared jointly with other States members of the Commonwealth of Independent States. I am sure that they are of direct interest to our forum particularly, as lately, and especially in the last month or so, the international community has been asking quite a number of serious questions about the fate of the vast military potential remaining from the USSR.

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

I am not going to deal with the entire statement, which will be issued as an official document of the Conference, I shall refer here to the main issues.

The statement expresses the Russian Federation's position of principle in favour of the elimination of nuclear and other means of mass destruction throughout the world and reaffirms all obligations under bilateral and multilateral arrangements in the field of arms limitation and disarmament signed by the Soviet Union and now in force, as well as the main principle in the building of armed forces, which will be the principle of reasonable minimum sufficiency of nuclear and conventional weapons.

In particular, Russia will pursue a policy towards radical reduction of nuclear weapons and ensuring the maximum security of nuclear weapons and all related facilities. In this connection, the statement proposes the setting up of an international agency to ensure the reduction of nuclear weapons, an agency which at subsequent stages could have under its control the whole nuclear cycle - from uranium mining and the production of deuterium and tritium to waste disposal.

The statement expresses the policy of the Russian leadership aimed at a maximum operational entry into force of the strategic offensive weapons treaty, but even before the entry into force of this treaty Russia will undertake a number of major steps aimed at the rollback of the strategic arsenal:

Some 600 land-based and sea-based strategic ballistic missiles, or almost 1,250 nuclear munitions have been taken off standby alert;

One hundred and thirty silo launchers for intercontinental ballistic missiles have been liquidated or are being prepared for liquidation;

Six atomic submarines have been prepared for dismantling of their missile launchers;

Programmes for the development or modernization of some types of strategic offensive weapons have been halted.

Strategic nuclear weapons deployed on the territory of Ukraine will be dismantled sooner than earlier planned. The relevant agreements to that effect have been reached.

What is more, the production of TU-106 and TU-95MS heavy bombers as well as the production of existing types of air-based long-range cruise missiles are being halted. Russia is prepared to refrain from the creation of new types of such missiles, on a mutual basis with the United States.

The production of existing types of sea-based long-range cruise missiles is being halted and new types of such missiles will not be created. At the same time, Russia is prepared - on a mutual basis - to eliminate all existing sea-based long-range cruise nuclear missiles.

(Mr. Datsanov, Russian Federation)

On the whole, Russia will get to the level contemplated by the Strategic Offensive Arms Treaty four years earlier than laid down under the treaty.

Major steps have been provided for also in respect of tactical nuclear weapons.

Recently, the production of nuclear warheads for land-based tactical missiles and the production of nuclear artillery shells and nuclear mines have been halted. Stockpiles of such nuclear munitions will be eliminated.

Russia is eliminating one third of sea-based tactical nuclear weapons and one half of the nuclear warheads for anti-aircraft missiles. It is also planned to reduce by half the stockpiles of airborne tactical nuclear munitions.

The statement stresses that Russia reaffirms its adherence to the ABM Treaty. At the same time, it expresses readiness to continue the impartial discussion of the United States proposal regarding limited non-nuclear ABM systems.

Moreover, Russia is prepared on a reciprocal basis with the United States to eliminate existing anti-satellite systems and to work out an arrangement on the complete prohibition of weapons specially designed to destroy satellites; it is also prepared jointly to develop and then to create and jointly operate a global defence system instead of SDI.

Russia resolutely advocates the prohibition of all nuclear testing. It is faithful to the year-long moratorium on nuclear explosions declared in October 1991 and hopes that other nuclear Powers will also refrain from nuclear testing. In the opinion of the Russian leadership, a climate of mutual restraint would further the achievement of an understanding on not carrying out such tests altogether. It is also possible to reduce the number of tests in stages.

In the interests of ultimately solving this task a proposal has been addressed to the United States to resume bilateral talks on the further limitations of nuclear testing.

Russia intends to continue implementing the programme for halting the production of weapons-grade plutonium. The proposal regarding the controlled cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes has also been reaffirmed.

In the statement considerable stress is laid on the problem of non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery. Russia reaffirms its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, including those assumed as its depositary. It is looking forward to the speedy accession to the Treaty as non-nuclear States by Belarus, Kazakhstan and the Ukraine as well as other member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

Russia declares its full support for the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency and is in favour of strengthening the effectiveness of its safeguards. Work is proceeding on Russia's attainment of the principle of full-scale or "IAEA comprehensive guarantees" as a condition of our peaceful nuclear exports.

Russia intends, as a matter of principle, to accede to the international regime for the non-proliferation of missile and missile technology as an equal partner. It also supports the efforts of the "Australian group" for control of chemical exports.

The Russian Federation intends to adopt domestic legislation regulating the export from Russia of "double purpose" materials, equipment and technology that could be used for the production of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons as well as battlefield missiles. A system of State control over such exports is being created.

Russia seeks to establish the closest cooperation and coordination among all the member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States on these issues.

The statement underlines - and now I am moving to what is clearly the key issue for the Conference's activity now that Russia advocates the earliest conclusion - already in 1992 - of a global convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. It is necessary reliably to block ways of gaining possession of chemical weapons without detriment to the legitimate economic interests of the parties to such a convention. Moreover, Russia adheres to the agreement with the United States on the non-production and elimination of chemical weapons signed in 1990. However, the agreement's timetable for the elimination of such weapons needs some adjustments.

All the chemical weapons of the former USSR are on Russian soil and the statement stresses that Russia assumes responsibility for their elimination.

Russia is open to cooperation on this issue with the United States and the other countries concerned.

Russia favours strict implementation of the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of Biological Weapons and the creation, on a multilateral basis, of relevant verification machinery and the implementation of confidence-building measures and openness.

Considering that the implementation of the Convention is lagging, Russia withdraws that part of the USSR's reservations to the 1925 Geneva Protocol that relate to the possibility of using biological weapons in retaliation.

The statement also contains provisions regarding European security, reduction of the defence budget and the conversion of military production.

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

In conclusion, for my own part, I should like once again to note that many provisions in the statement have a direct bearing on the work of the Conference on Disarmament and on other areas in our joint activities in Geneva. This plan of action of Russia aims at making people's lives quieter, safer and better. Thank you for your attention.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Russian Federation for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

Does any other delegation wish to take the floor at this stage? I give the floor to the representative of Sweden, Ambassador Hyltenius.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): Mr. President, I shall have the opportunity to congratulate you formally on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference very soon, but on this occasion I have asked for the floor to thank you, as well as Ambassador Batsanov, for your kind words about the former Head of the Swedish delegation, Ambassador Maj Britt Theorin. I shall, of course, not fail to convey your words of appreciation and your good wishes to Mrs. Theorin, who, as a Member of Parliament, continues to be engaged in the vital questions of disarmament.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Sweden for his statement and see that no one else wishes to take the floor.

In accordance with our programme of work, beginning next week we shall hold only one plenary meeting, preferably on Thursdays. That means that there will be ample time for informal consultations among members until we meet again at a plenary meeting. I invite the members of the Conference to put the time available to good use by intensifying their consultations on a number of questions which are still pending. In addition to a number of organizational and procedural matters dealing with our agenda and programme of work, several issues relating to the establishment of subsidiary bodies need action by us. The question of the participation of the 39 non-members who have transmitted their requests is foremost in my mind and I do hope that we will be able to dispose of this matter without further delay next week.

I have no other business for today and I intend now to adjourn this plenary meeting.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 6 February, at 10 a.m. The plenary meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 10.45 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.610
6 February 1992

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND TENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 6 February 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Naste Calovski (Yugoslavia)

GE.92-60241/4207B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 610th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

We shall now proceed to take a decision on 39 requests from non-members to participate in the work of the Conference and its subsidiary bodies, in accordance with rules 33 to 35 of the rules of procedure. All these requests have already been circulated to the members of the Conference, for their information. Accordingly, I invite you to consider the Note by the President, which was circulated as document CD/WP.420 and to which all the requests are attached. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. BELL-GAM (Nigeria): Mr. President, as this is the first time my delegation is taking the floor, I would like to convey our appreciation at seeing you in the Chair and to also convey our willingness to cooperate with you in the discharge of your duties. We would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the past President and to thank him for the excellent work he did during his presidency.

Mr. President, the Nigerian delegation is aware of the commendable role most non-member States to the CD have played, especially in the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. This year we have already received over 36 such applications, including that of South Africa.

The Nigerian delegation is aware of the pervasive feeling of optimism in certain circles that the conclusion and signature by South Africa of the Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency, subsequent to its July 1991 accession to the NPT, have diminished if not totally removed the threat posed by South Africa's nuclear programme and attendant weapon capability. Undoubtedly, this development bodes well for non-proliferation.

However, the journey along that road, and the removal of the threat has only just begun. That process could only be propelled forward, if the entire range of South Africa's nuclear installation and material are placed under full-scope IAEA Safeguards. As developments in other regions indicate, the cooperation of the international community with the Agency in that process is particularly crucial to the restoration of confidence that South Africa would abide by the intent and letter of her agreement.

Mr. President, our concept of security goes beyond the traditional concerns of military security. Like the rest of the world, what Africa needs now more than at any other time in the past, are a stable, peaceful and secure environment and freedom as well as the right to pursue our chosen path democratically.

We are currently negotiating a multilateral Convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of

(Mr. Bell-Gam, Nigeria)

chemical weapons and on their destruction. There is every reason to believe that South Africa possesses chemical weapons. There must be an assurance that as an Observer, they will not only contribute constructively towards elaborating the Convention but also recognize the paramount need for universality. For that reason, my delegation will not block consensus this time around, as all potential violators should be brought into the negotiating process. Nigeria reserves the right to block future consensus on this matter. This is more so until South Africa becomes a free, democratic and non-racial society and conducts herself in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

It is both a matter of enlightened self-interest and the future stability of Africa, which dictate that we give focused attention to the integration of the quest for disarmament, security and development as the greatest challenges of our time.

The PRESIDENT: I thank you for your statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair.

In connection with the decision that we have just taken, I wish to recall the statement made by my predecessor at the 603rd plenary meeting on 22 August 1991 on seating arrangements for non-member participants in our work: "As regards seating arrangements, non-member participants shall be seated in meetings following the English alphabetical list, beginning with the non-member whose name will be drawn by lot by the President immediately after the initial decision is taken by the Conference, at the beginning of the year, on requests for participation, and rotate at the same time as the Conference."

I shall proceed to do so after adjournment of this plenary meeting, with the assistance of the secretariat.

I wish to note, at this stage, that Chile is included among the non-members who are now invited to participate in our work. I take this opportunity to extend to the representative of Chile in the Conference the deeply felt condolences of members and non-members participating in our work, on the passing away of Ambassador Radomiro Tomic, a well-known political figure in Latin America, who had represented Chile in the Conference during previous annual sessions and whom we had learnt to respect and admire. During his tenure as Permanent Representative of Chile in Geneva, Ambassador Tomic played a major role in all the Geneva-based organizations and I am sure that we shall all miss him. I would kindly request the distinguished representative of Chile to convey also to his Government and to the family of the deceased our sincere condolences.

I have on my list of speakers today the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons for the 1991 session of the Conference, Ambassador Batsanov of the Russian Federation, who will introduce the report of the Ad Hoc Committee contained in document CD/1116.

I give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Batsanov.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (translated from Russian): Thank you Mr. President. First of all, I should like to express my satisfaction over the fact that we have just taken a decision on the participation in the work of our Conference for this year of a large number of countries which are not members of the Conference on Disarmament. They now number 39, a number which equals that of the Conference members, and this is a quite interesting development. I am convinced that these non-member States in respect of whom we have just adopted this positive decision will make an active and constructive contribution to our work. I take this opportunity also to express my gratitude to you, Sir, for the consensus that it has been possible to reach under your leadership. In addition, I should also like to associate myself with your words of condolence addressed to our Chilean colleagues in connection with the passing away of Ambassador Radomiro Tomic, whom all of us knew so well and greatly respected.

Today, I should like to introduce the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which I had the honour to chair during the 1991 session of the Conference on Disarmament. As you have indicated, Mr. President, this report has been distributed by the secretariat as document CD/1116, dated 20 January 1992, and it describes the results of the Ad Hoc Committee's work for the period from September 1991 to 20 January 1992 inclusive.

The report retains the format of previous years: a technical part, the draft text of the Convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction (Appendix I); and an Appendix II, which contains various papers reflecting results of work undertaken on a number of issues relating to the draft Convention. In comparing this report with the preceding report of the Ad Hoc Committee, contained in document CD/1108, one cannot fail to note that during the latest period the so-called rolling text has been amplified with a good deal of new material, much of it formulated in treaty language. This mainly concerns verification issues, which have been among the central issues in our negotiations. Appendix I contains wording for the second part of article IX - a space that has long remained blank.

Furthermore, part III of the Protocol on Inspection Procedures has been considerably redone, its text reflecting new ideas put forward in the course of last year and the results of their discussion by the participants in negotiations. Appendix II contains new texts of annexes to article VI reflecting the considerable work done on clarifying and improving the verification mechanism for civilian chemical industry. Appendix II also contains for the first time provisions in treaty language pertaining to the composition, functions and decision-making procedure of the executive council. Also to be found in Appendix II are draft provisions on the financing of the future organization and the results of last year's discussion of so-called old stocks of chemical weapons.

Numerous additions and clarifications have been introduced into the draft Convention representing the results of the work done in various structures of the Ad Hoc Committee; and a number of footnotes that reflected unagreed

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

positions on the part of participants have been eliminated. This concerns primarily the inclusion of definitions relating to the chemical industry in article II "Definitions and Criteria", and the "footnote purge" of articles XVII "Signature", XIX "Accession" and XXI "Entry into Force". Thus, for the first time in the history of the negotiations, we now have all the articles of the draft convention formulated in treaty language. Of course, many of them are open to further considerable work. The status of the various elements is not the same and I should like to stress that in my opinion more could have been achieved during the past year. Progress in the solution of a number of important issues turned out to be less significant than might have been expected. Evidently, the Chairman too did not exploit all the opportunities that presented themselves in the negotiating process.

But, be that as it may, I believe that we now have a real prospect of completing the negotiations successfully in the course of 1992. At the same time, unless the pace of agreeing our positions on substance increases in the very near future, this opportunity too may become uncertain. We are now coming under extreme time pressure and all of us must clearly bear this in mind. The success or failure of the negotiations will not only mean the realization or the abandonment of the idea of creating a world free from chemical weapons, with all the consequences of either for the security of every one of our countries, but also will have a most telling impact on the dynamics of the disarmament process as a whole, on the attitude of Governments to the potential of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and, if you will, on the fate of our forum, the Conference on Disarmament.

Therefore, the time has come in the negotiations on chemical weapons to separate the primary from the secondary, the priority tasks from issues which can be put off to a later time without harm to our goal or to one's positions, to separate real from fancied interests and real concerns from bargaining chips. Indeed, just to solve highly complex problems of principle requires immense pressure, unorthodox attitudes, inventiveness and a willingness to make mutual concessions on the part of the participants in the negotiations and the members of the Ad Hoc Committee and its Bureau headed by its Chairman.

I venture to express the view that at this stage special attention and efforts are demanded by such issues as challenge inspections, verification in commercial industry, the future of export control measures, the composition of the executive council and the problem of so-called "old" chemical weapons.

It should also be borne in mind that the present "rolling text" is the result of years of effort. Some of its provisions do not form the happiest combination with others. They, or other sections and wordings reflect concepts and a vision of security and of the objectives of the future convention that differ as to the time of their formulation and as to substance. Some of them may no longer entirely correspond to the new realities. Therefore, this material needs to be reduced to a common denominator.

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

I would like, however, to conclude on an optimistic note and express confidence that the document being presented today will be the last "rolling text" of the draft convention and that the next report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons submitted to the Conference will contain the final agreed draft.

Mr. President, in summing up the results for the past year, I cannot fail to mention the important contribution to the negotiations made by the members of the Ad Hoc Committee's Bureau, the Chairman of Working Group A, Mr. Mashhadi (Iran), the Chairman of Working Group B, Mr. Gizowski (Poland), the Chairman of Working Group C, Mr. Perugini (Italy), and the friends of the Chair, Ambassador Brotodiningrat of Indonesia, Mr. Canonne (France) and Mr. Meerburg (Netherlands). They went about their difficult functions, sacrificing their spare time, with a high degree of responsibility. To a large extent it is thanks to their efforts that progress could be made on a number of the unsettled issues we faced.

I should also like to express my warmest words of gratitude to the personnel of the secretariat and in the first place to our virtually permanent Secretary of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons Mr. Bensmail and his deputy, Ms. Hoppe, as well as to Ms. Darby. Their experience and professionalism are highly prized by all participants in the negotiations. I express my gratitude also to the interpreters and translators, with their wonderful knowledge not only of linguistic nuances but also of chemical terminology.

And, naturally, I cannot fail to express my profound thanks to all delegations and representatives of States members and non-members of the Conference on Disarmament for their cooperation, for their readiness to find mutually acceptable solutions and for their support of others, including me as Chairman, and to all members of the Bureau of our Ad Hoc Committee for the period now concluding.

In completing my work as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee by introducing this report today, I want with all my heart to wish the present Chairman, the distinguished Ambassador of Germany, His Excellency, Adolf Ritter von Wagner, the greatest success at this crucial stage of finalization of the work on such a profound and complex document as this first multilateral disarmament instrument in the history of mankind. His great diplomatic experience, his fine sense of tact, his purposefulness and his ability to find mutually acceptable compromises in the most difficult situations are the qualities that led to Ambassador von Wagner's election to the post of Chairman. Ambassador von Wagner faces complex, difficult but solvable tasks. I wish to assure him that the delegation of the Russian Federation, and here I am speaking as the Ambassador of my country, is open to the closest possible cooperation with him in achieving our common lofty goal, the conclusion of a multilateral convention banning chemical weapons. With that I will conclude.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Russian Federation for introducing the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I wish also to congratulate him on the hard work that he has done so successfully as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee. 1991 was a year of substantial progress in the negotiations on the draft convention banning all chemical weapons. The report tabled today will be the basis for our work this year, when we are expected to conclude the draft convention.

I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil, Ambassador Amorim, who will speak on behalf of the delegations of Argentina and Brazil.

Mr. AMORIM (Brazil): Mr. President, first of all, I want to stress in my own name and in that of my delegation, the grief we all experienced on the passing away of Ambassador Radomiro Tomic, a very distinguished diplomat and indeed a statesman, who was a symbol of dedication to the values of democracy and social justice in Chile and in Latin America. Let me also ask you, Mr. President, to convey to Ambassador Calovski my congratulations on his appointment as President of the Conference on Disarmament. We have already witnessed many fruitful results made possible by his able guidance in this important period of the session when understanding and compromise are so needed, so that the Conference can have an appropriate start. I would also like to extend to Ambassador Horacio Argeaga of Venezuela, a good friend of Brazil, the congratulations and thanks on the part of my delegation, and also in the name of that of Argentina, for the very proficient way in which he discharged his duties as the last President of the Conference on Disarmament for the 1991 session.

In August 1991, before the end of last year's session of the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Roberto García Moritán, of Argentina, addressed this plenary in the name of the delegations of Brazil and Argentina, to provide information with regard to the Agreement for the Exclusively Peaceful Use of Nuclear Energy, signed by the Ministers of External Relations of our two countries on 18 July 1991 in Guadalajara, Mexico.

On behalf of the delegations of Argentina and Brazil, it is now my pleasure, and indeed my honour, to refer to that bilateral nuclear agreement as well as to the safeguards agreement our Governments concluded with the International Atomic Energy Agency last December. We requested the secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament to circulate the texts of both agreements as official documents of the Conference. They have been published with reference numbers CD/1117 and CD/1118.

The agreement between Brazil and Argentina for the exclusively peaceful use of nuclear energy was approved by the Congresses of our two countries and entered into force on 12 December 1991. In its article V it established a common system of accounting and control of nuclear materials, with the objective of verifying that nuclear materials in all nuclear activities are not diverted to nuclear weapons or other explosive nuclear devices. To perform this task, a Brazilian-Argentine agency for accounting and control of nuclear materials was created.

(Mr. Amorim, Brazil)

In a very short period of time, a little more than one year, intensive negotiations were carried out by our Governments, bilaterally and with the Agency. This effort made it possible to conclude a comprehensive safeguards agreement involving Argentina, Brazil, the Brazilian-Argentine Agency and the International Atomic Energy Agency itself, which was signed in Vienna on 13 December 1991. To underscore the importance our Governments attached to this whole process, Presidents Collor and Menem were present at the ceremony when the safeguards agreement was signed.

When the safeguards agreement was considered by the Agency Board of Governors on 5 and 6 December, it was referred to by member countries as a possible model for other regions, for it was seen as an important development for the strengthening of the safeguards system and a concrete contribution to non-proliferation. While presenting the agreement for consideration, the Governor for Brazil said he was convinced that it was "a good agreement for us, for the Agency and, indeed, for the international community".

The cooperation developed between Argentina and Brazil for a number of years now in the nuclear field, the exchange of knowledge, experts and materials, numerous technical visits and joint projects, already provided a very high degree of transparency in one of the most sensitive areas of advanced technology. In this connection, let me add a personal note by saying that Ambassador García Moritán and myself as well as other members of our delegations are very proud to have directly participated in this process of cooperation and confidence-building, which paved the way for the conclusion of the nuclear and safeguards agreements we are presenting to you today.

In the view of our Governments, that process of cooperation and those two agreements provide sufficient assurance of the peaceful objectives of our countries' nuclear programmes. While acting in a transparent and responsible manner in this and in other fields of dual-use high technology, we hope to establish a precedent to be followed. It is our expectation that these actions will be matched by the clear recognition in practice, as well as in theory, of our legitimate right to acquire and develop advanced technologies essential to the well-being of our peoples. We also expect the possessors of weapons of mass destruction to commit themselves to accelerated disarmament and to the effective elimination of their nuclear arsenals. This is the option for a safe and stable world in the future.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Brazil for the statement that he has just made on behalf of the delegations of Argentina and Brazil, as well as for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other member wish to take the floor at this stage?

I recognize the representative of Chile and I give him the floor.

Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, I should like to thank you for your heartfelt tribute to him who was our dear Ambassador, Radomiro Tomic, who as you know was an outstanding personality in Chilean politics and diplomacy: founder of the Christian Democratic Party, senator, candidate for President of the Republic in 1970 and Chile's Ambassador to Washington, among many other posts he occupied with special and great dignity.

My thanks go also to the delegations of Peru, Mexico, the Russian Federation, Argentina and Brazil, as well as for the numerous expressions of solidarity which we have received outside of this room from the distinguished members of this Conference on Disarmament and all of which demonstrate great sincerity and appreciation, which we value in their full dimension.

There is need for me to say, Mr. President, that I shall have the honour to convey to my Government and to the Tomic family the sentiments expressed at this meeting and the other condolences mentioned, which will be received gratefully and with affection.

Ambassador Tomic, Mr. President, attached the greatest importance to the work of this Conference and to disarmament in general. With his characteristic passion, he often expressed his moral rejection of unrestrained military expenditure in a world in which millions of human beings live under the scourges of poverty, ignorance and disease. Back in 1965, at an international meeting of the World Christian Democratic Youth, which took place in Berlin, Ambassador Tomic, at that time Ambassador of Chile to the United States, said: "My duty and yours is to seek truth to commit ourselves to the utmost to peace and against war. This is the decisive battle of our times and it cannot be won without giving viable political expression to the essential oneness of the human race, making a reality of international justice between powerful and weak States, translating the solidarity of the rich peoples with the developing peoples into deeds of massive magnitude to make it fitting. That is the only true battle for peace".

Tomic, paradoxically, was a fighter for peace and justice. He defined his life as a struggle, himself as a champion of the poor and the exploited within the parameters revealed to him by his profound Christian faith. This was shown when, in addressing this Conference on 28 February 1991, he said, quoting His Holiness, John Paul II: In this world, divided and disturbed by conflicts of every kind, the conviction is growing of a radical interdependence and consequently of a necessary solidarity to accept it and to shift it into the sphere of morality. Today, perhaps more than ever before, men realize that they have a common destiny to build together if they wish to avoid catastrophe for all.

It is for those values that we shall always remember Ambassador Tomic. We sincerely thank you for associating yourselves with that memory and with the deep sorrow of all Chileans.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of Chile. I recognize the distinguished representative of the United States of America and I give him the floor.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): Mr. President, I have asked for the floor on behalf of the Western Group of States members of the Conference on Disarmament to join the expressions of condolence upon the passing away of Ambassador Radomiro Tomic, the former Ambassador of Chile to this Conference.

Ambassador Tomic dedicated heart and soul to his high office. He played an active role in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. He was held in high esteem by his colleagues for his professional and personal skills. His integrity, his intellectual qualities, his sincerity were valued by all of us. He will be remembered as a man of great ability and good will who not only represented his country with distinction, but also gained our friendship and respect.

On behalf of the Western Group, Mr. President, I extend to the delegation of Chile and to Ambassador Tomic's family, our deeply felt condolences and sympathy.

The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Poland.

Mr. GIZOWSKI (Poland): Mr. President, it is with deep regret that we have learnt during the inter-sessional period, of the passing away of our former colleague, Ambassador Radomiro Tomic, Permanent Representative of Chile as a non-member State. The Eastern Group wishes, through me, to convey to the distinguished delegation of Chile, its sincere solidarity and deep sadness. Ambassador Tomic was dedicated to this body and made a valuable contribution to its work. We wish to extend our heartfelt condolences at the premature death of this distinguished and eminent colleague, to his family with whom we share the pain of this irreparable loss. He will remain in our memory for ever.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform you that the President is continuing his consultations concerning a number of organizational questions before the Conference. In that connection, I am pleased to report to you that agreement has been reached on how we should deal with agenda item 2, "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament" and agenda item 3, "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters". We shall hold a series of informal meetings on the agenda items, and the discussions at those informal meetings will be duly reflected in the annual report of the Conference to the General Assembly of the United Nations. The President will, after the decision is taken, read out his list of topics, which will not be binding on any delegation. This arrangement will be taken up at our next plenary meeting, when I hope that we will be in a position to advance further our consideration of organizational matters.

I have no other business for today.

(The President)

Before I adjourn this plenary meeting, I should like to recall that we shall hold an informal open-ended consultation in this conference room, in five minutes' time, on the best modalities for addressing the question of "Transparency in armaments", which has been transmitted to us by General Assembly resolution 46/36 L.

As you know, we are now holding one plenary meeting per week, on Thursdays, in accordance with the decision taken at the 575th plenary meeting of the Conference. However, we also agreed on that occasion that flexible provisions would be made to allow for a second plenary at any time. I have been informed that we might expect a high-level visitor who wishes to address the Conference early next week. May I therefore suggest that we authorize the secretariat to convene that second plenary meeting upon confirmation of that visit.

I see no objection. We shall proceed accordingly.

This means that, in addition to our regular plenary meeting on Thursday, 13 February, at 10 a.m., we might hold another plenary meeting earlier in the week.

The meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.611
12 February 1992

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND ELEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 12 February 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Naste Calovski (Yugoslavia)

GE.92-60284/4219B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 611th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

At the outset, I wish to extend a warm welcome, on behalf of the Conference, to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, His Excellency Andrei Kozyrev. A graduate of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations and holder of a high scientific degree in history, the Minister is the author of a number of publications on arms control and disarmament, as well as on the work of the United Nations and current international questions. He has wide experience in the work of international organizations, having been Director of the competent Department, in which he was actively involved in disarmament subjects, and participated frequently in the sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations and other international forums. In October 1990 he was appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, a high-level position in which he was confirmed in October last year. As this is the first time that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation is visiting the Conference on Disarmament to address it, his presence here today assumes particular importance. I am sure that all members of the Conference will follow his statement with special interest, as it will provide us with a substantial contribution for our future work.

I have on my list of speakers for this meeting the representatives of the Russian Federation, Germany and the Netherlands.

I now give the floor to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, His Excellency Andrei Kozyrev.

Mr. KOZYREV (Russian Federation) (translated from Russian): Allow me to begin by expressing the pleasure and the honour that the privilege of speaking from this high rostrum gives me and by welcoming many old friends in this room. I should also like to wish you, Mr. President, the representative of a friendly country, success in your work as President of the Conference and to assure you of our full support; let me also express our appreciation to the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Komatina, for all he has done to make its work effective.

Permit me now to read out a message to the Conference from the President of the Russian Federation, Boris N. Yeltsin:

> "My greetings to the participants in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament! This year marks the thirtieth anniversary since the time when multilateral negotiations on the limitation and reduction of armaments began in Geneva. Over these years, they have scored important results: treaties and agreements limiting the arms race in outer space and on Earth. Of special significance is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, whose strictest observance and strengthening is today's international political priority.

(Mr. Kozyrev, Russian Federation)

Recent talks with the leaders of many States and the results of the summit meeting of the United Nations Security Council show that qualitatively new, friendly relations are being created - in the long run, even relations of alliance - between former potential adversaries. A unique opportunity is emerging to rid ourselves through joint efforts of the over-armament we have all inherited from the cold war.

Given these circumstances, the Conference on Disarmament, too, must proceed to solve unprecedently bold tasks. First of all, it is essential this very year to complete the drafting of the Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

I wish to assure you that Russia will honestly and openly cooperate with other countries in achieving the lofty goals of the Conference on Disarmament."

Mr. President, the main orientations of the policy of the Russian Federation in the field of limitation and reduction of armaments have recently been set out in the United Nations and during summit meetings in the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada and France.

They are predicated on the firm conviction that the new Russia is not even a potential adversary of other States, whether in the West, East, North or South.

This world outlook of ours, as our contacts have shown, is shared by other States. All this creates a fundamentally new political context, applying also to the work of the Conference on Disarmament. The "disarmament game" between ideological adversaries trying to outsmart one another is over.

From now on, the Conference on Disarmament can and must become a forum of like-minded people faced with the task of clearing away the log-jam of the physical substructure of past confrontation.

And here there will be a job to do for everyone - both for the former East-West opponents and for those who sought to help them reach compromises - the non-aligned and neutral countries. The latter played an extremely important role in preventing the "cold" war of that time from escalating into a "hot" one. Now, we are counting on associating the vast intellectual potential of their experts in the task of dismantling the military juggernaut and, most of all, on their active involvement in the arms-reduction and confidence-building measures themselves.

These are not easy tasks, for behind the gigantic military machines generated during the years of the cold war are the future lives of people, immense production capacities and mountains of weapons. Thus, the problem of military conversion - the conversion of military industry, scientific knowledge and human resources acquires special urgency.

(Mr. Kozyrev, Russian Federation)

The gap between the new political realities and the military technological situation presents itself in the most dramatic terms in the fact that the strategic forces of the nuclear Powers, despite their political positions, remain targeted on each other's territories. The absurdity of such a situation is self-evident. The problem, therefore, is how to transfer the revolution in political thinking and mutual perceptions to the plane of military technical solutions.

Of course, the best solution would be the total elimination of nuclear weapons but we are aware that this cannot be done overnight. Consequently, we have to look for other, possibly less radical but no less effective, ways of removing the danger.

It is in this context that one should view our proposal that the strategic offensive weapons which Russia and the United States will retain after the upcoming deep cuts should not be targeted on United States or Russian facilities, respectively, nor, indeed, on other countries. Tentatively, I would suggest the following ideas for implementing this proposal.

First, we might consider the question of taking off alert status the strategic forces of Russia, the United States and other nuclear Powers that are targeted on one another's territories and facilities, thereby attaining a kind of "zero action-readiness" of nuclear weapons.

Secondly, separate storage of nuclear weapons' delivery vehicles and warheads could play a useful role. In other words, the ICBMs would be on launchers without their front sections. SLBMs and SLCMs would be unloaded from submarines, which in turn would be berthed in home ports, and the nuclear weapons of heavy bombers, including nuclear ALCMs would be kept in centralized storage depots. That would provide assurance against the unauthorized or accidental use of nuclear weapons. Another advantage of such a measure is that it would be verifiable and the details of verification, I am sure, could be agreed upon.

Thirdly, there is a need for a fundamental reassessment of the entire military-strategic situation in the world and, accordingly, of nuclear military doctrines.

Lastly, is it not time to take a new look at the ideas proposed in the past concerning control of nuclear weapons by an international organization, for example, the United Nations?

Moreover, thought might be given to exchanging on a reciprocal basis among all nuclear Powers data on the number and types of existing nuclear weapons, the quantity of fissionable materials and on nuclear-weapons production, storage and elimination facilities. Agreement to that effect could be reached at the Conference on Disarmament, in which all the nuclear Powers are represented and which has experience in dealing with similar issues in the context of the negotiations on chemical weapons.

(Mr. Kozyrev, Russian Federation)

At the same time, we believe that the main contribution to resolving all questions relating to nuclear disarmament must now be made by Russia and the United States. Other nuclear Powers could join the process of nuclear disarmament later, when the nuclear arsenals of all the States possessing them will have become comparable. That is the impression we have of the position of the United Kingdom and France, with whose leaders we have only recently discussed these problems.

The issue of the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems has arisen anew. Russia is adopting a complex of measures aimed at ensuring that the break-up of the former Soviet Union should not provoke such proliferation or to the emergence of several nuclear States in place of the USSR. It is our understanding that Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan will accede to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as non-nuclear countries.

The Russian Federation intends to become a full-fledged participant in the international Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). It supports the useful work being done by the "Australian group" on the non-proliferation of chemical weapons. Russia is setting up a State export-control system for "dual-purpose" materials and technology and the relevant laws are being drafted. Our approach on this issue is consistent with the position of other States members of the CIS, in line with the Alma-Ata agreements of last December.

The non-proliferation problem has also a human dimension. We share the concern of some countries about a possible "draining" of our experts engaged in the development of dangerous weapons, given the curtailment of military programmes in Russia and the lifting of restrictions on travel abroad. We are in favour of timely measures on this problem, measures which, naturally, are not contrary to international human rights standards, including freedom of travel.

We believe that a most effective solution would be the involvement of experts and scientists from Russia and other CIS States in major international conversion projects - in order to make maximum use of their vast scientific, intellectual and productive potential for peaceful, creative purposes. Of course, for such cooperation to be productive we need very soon to have an exchange of information, including information which in the past was in the "sensitive" category, i.e. information on the material and expertise potential of laboratories, research institutes and production facilities employed in the defence field. Without an exchange of information, cooperation in the area of conversion will be hampered.

Here, an important role could be played by the creation of an international scientific centre which would be responsible for coordinating research in such areas as fundamental and applied physics, alternate sources of energy including thermonuclear fusion, nuclear power plant safety, rehabilitation of the environment after pollution resulting from nuclear activities, destruction or alternate utilization of weapons of mass destruction, safe burial of wastes, etc.

(Mr. Kozyrev, Russian Federation)

We also support the ideas put forward in this regard by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, concerning the preparation and adoption of international measures to prevent unauthorized transfers of carriers of sensitive information.

Russia supports the arms-trade guidelines approved in London in October 1991 as well as the resolution on arms transparency adopted at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly. Beginning next year, we are prepared to participate in the submission of arms-trade data for inclusion in the Register to be compiled under the United Nations resolution.

At the same time, it is our understanding that, in keeping with the right to self-defence established in the United Nations Charter, any country can acquire arms in accordance, of course, with accepted international principles.

On this question, Russia is no longer guided by ideological approaches or concepts of military-force counteraction with respect to other major arms producers. We are open to cooperation in this field on a commercial basis with all States. Of course, in this we will strictly abide by the decisions of the international community regarding the non-delivery of weapons to particular countries, nor of course will we export weapons of mass destruction, their delivery systems or their production technology. Likewise, we will refrain from military deliveries liable to destabilize the situation in a particular area.

We attach great importance to regional initiatives in the field of arms limitation and strengthening of security. We are convinced that they deserve support. Generally speaking, the sphere of regional disarmament and confidence-building measures may become one of the most important areas for the Conference on Disarmament.

We are, of course, in favour of activating the work of the Conference in such an important field as the prohibition of nuclear testing.

Russia is a convinced proponent of prevention of an arms race in outer space. We firmly advocate the maintenance of the ABM Treaty with the United States and the non-deployment in outer space of weapons of any kind.

Now a few words on our proposal on a joint global system of protection instead of the SDI. What we have in mind is a programme of joint research that, among other things, would help address the problem of preventing a brain drain from the defence complex of nuclear and space Powers. It is our hope that the results of such research in the area of advanced technologies can be used for peaceful purposes in the interests of the whole international community. A global system of protection must become not a new "Berlin wall" of the North against the South, but an effective safeguard protecting all countries from possible moves by adventurist, irresponsible politicians and terrorists.

(Mr. Kozyrev, Russian Federation)

Now, Mr. President, let me come back to the principal and most urgent task before the Conference: the completion of the negotiations on the total prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. What are now beginning to acquire special significance in the negotiations are the economic factors connected with compliance with the obligations under this agreement. This is quite natural since the Convention, unlike any other previously concluded multilateral disarmament agreements, will affect the broadest sectors of the economy. That is why Russia believes that it is extremely important that, while effectively blocking the roads to possession of chemical weapons, the Convention should take into account the legitimate economic interests of the parties to it and also be "economical" in the sphere of verification.

In particular, there are serious doubts whether the complete destruction of former chemical weapons production facilities would be advisable. Especially in view of our current economic difficulties, we believe that it would be more justified to leave open the possibility of utilizing some of the equipment and buildings of such former facilities for the purposes of peaceful production, subject of course, to the elimination of equipment directly connected with the production and filling of chemical weapons and the existence of other safeguards, including international verification that would reliably preclude any attempt to reconvert such facilities to activities prohibited under the Convention.

I shall not hide the fact that Russia faces extremely difficult problems in connection with the destruction of chemical weapons. It was not Russia that took the decisions which resulted in the presence on its territory of 40,000 tons of toxic substances that are difficult to eliminate, although we have assumed full responsibility for their destruction.

Russia possesses the technology required for the destruction of chemical weapons. The main problem is obtaining the consent of the population and local authorities for the construction of the necessary facilities. I think that international cooperation and some help from abroad could play a role in resolving these problems. Such cooperation could be instrumental in guaranteeing the ecological cleanness of the destruction process and in creating incentives among the local population for having such facilities nearby, etc. We would support the idea of creating a kind of "ecopolis" in areas where destruction facilities might be established.

It is necessary for all States ultimately to accede to the future Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. This is favoured by the momentous change that has occurred in the world situation. Fears that participation in the Convention might have negative effects on security are lessening. The guarantees of the Security Council are becoming more effective. It is now working as was envisaged by the founders of the United Nations; that, in any case, is how things are moving. Russia intends to so participate in this work as to make a weighty contribution to the strengthening of universal security. Of course, in all these matters we are cooperating most closely with other States members of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

(Mr. Kozyrev, Russian Federation)

I should like to take this opportunity, Mr. President, to wish success to the new Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador von Wagner, and to assure him of our unswerving support.

In conclusion, I should like to stress that now that the international community has entered a stage of what amounts to "landslide disarmament" and the agenda includes finding solutions to difficult military-technical questions of eliminating weapons, the tasks of the Conference are becoming immeasurably more complex. Nevertheless, we are convinced that it will successfully cope with them and we, for our part, have shared with you some ideas and suggestions which not so much contain answers to those questions as they demonstrate our desire to join you in seeking solutions.

I wish you success in your work.

The PRESIDENT: I thank His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation for his important statement and for the kind words he addressed to me.

I wish, in particular, to thank him for the message addressed to us by the President of the Russian Federation, His Excellency Boris Yeltsin, which I am sure is appreciated by all members and non-members of the Conference participating in our work.

I now give the floor to the representative of Germany, Ambassador von Wagner.

Mr. von WAGNER (Germany): Mr. President, may I, through you, thank the Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation, His Excellency Andrei Kozyrev, for the kind words he addressed to Minister Genscher and to my humble self.

With our negotiations on the Chemical Weapons Convention entering a final stage and our common goal coming within reach, very practical issues become more and more important. I am referring to those issues related to the work of the Preparatory Committee and the establishment of the future organization. In this context, one important issue is the composition of the staff of the future Technical Secretariat and Inspectorate.

Today, in my capacity as head of the German delegation, I would like to reiterate what has always been our position in this respect: We believe that the recruitment of staff personnel must provide, of course, the appropriate verification expertise to the Technical Secretariat. This, however, would not be enough. It must also be ensured that personnel from all regions be included in the technical staff.

In this context, the German Government has welcomed the active role of Finland in research and development of analytical methods of verification, a project recognized and appreciated by all of us. Finland has also taken the lead in sharing the experience it has gained in this field, not only through

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

publication of a series of the well-known "Blue Books"; by organizing and conducting training courses for participants from developing countries, the Finnish Project continues to contribute substantively to the build-up or reinforcement of a pool of skilled technical personnel in the third world who could serve as inspectors under the future organization. More than 20 analytical experts from many developing countries will have attended these courses by the end of this year. Some of the participants reported to the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons on their positive experience.

Some time ago, Norway informed the Conference on Disarmament on plans to conduct similar training courses. I very much welcome the fact that other countries feel encouraged by Finland's example to organize their own training courses, thus recognizing the importance of such an endeavour.

Mr. President, I am pleased to inform the Conference on Disarmament today that Germany, like Norway, has decided to contribute to our common efforts by conducting a first such training course this year, which is intended to be complementary to, rather than duplicating, the Finnish programme. The aim of our two-week course is the training of analytical chemists in some of the specific methods and the use of instruments of the type needed for on-site verification tasks under the future Chemical Weapons Convention. The participants in the first Finnish training course of 1992 from Argentina, India, Mexico and Morocco have also been invited to attend this follow-up course, to be held at the NBC Defence Establishment in Munster from 1 to 12 June 1992.

The programme of the course, which is organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defence of the Federal Republic of Germany, was set up in close cooperation and coordination with Finland. It concentrates on practical exercises to enable future inspectors to act on-site in a safe and efficient manner. The programme includes

the handling of CW agent samples, in connection with the use of personal protection equipment;

specific field sampling techniques and on-the-spot identification of samples using a mobile mass spectrometer;

the investigation of munitions using non-destructive interrogation methods.

The course will also touch on the issue of old chemical weapons destruction. Furthermore, it will include a visit to a plant site in the chemical industry in Germany.

The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands, Ambassador Wagenmakers.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): Allow me to congratulate you, Mr. President, upon your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. We, the representatives of the CD member States, have been provided with palpable proof of the successful application of your diplomatic skill and talent in the discharge of duties pertaining to the high office that is yours. Most important, the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons has been set to work smoothly without delay. Then, the package decision on the admission of non-member States forms no small part of the credit you raised. I would also like to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Horacio Arteaga of Venezuela, for his high-quality contribution to the CD's work, both in the last month of the 1991 session and during the following inter-sessional period.

It is a great honour for me to address this august body at the same meeting at which we were given the privilege to listen to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. I would like to underscore the warm welcome which you extended to Minister Andrei Kozyrev and to thank the Minister for his important thought-provoking address. I would be remiss, Mr. President, if I did not salute the representatives of so many observer States here in this room. I consider their presence in our midst as a commitment on their behalf to the objectives which the Conference on Disarmament is trying to attain.

As the Chairman of the 1991 Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons stated in introducing its report to the plenary on 6 February last, we have reached the final stage of the negotiations on a chemical weapons convention. We have set ourselves a deadline. And we are going to meet that deadline. Keeping that in mind, it is not too early to start thinking seriously about practical steps in preparation for the implementation of the convention.

Granted, a considerable amount of preparatory work has already been done. Studies have been made on the structure and cost of the future Organization on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) by, inter alia, the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States, the Netherlands and independent consultants. Finland and the Netherlands jointly presented papers last year on the required laboratory facilities for the organization and their quality control. A wealth of material on the tasks of the Preparatory Commission can be found in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons.

Last August, when the Ambassadors to the CD visited The Hague with a view to familiarizing themselves with The Hague as the proposed seat of the OPCW, they were asked whether they thought a seminar on the OPCW, especially during its early years of existence, would assist our deliberations, here in Geneva. Encouraged by the many positive answers received, the competent Netherlands authorities have further examined the idea of holding such a seminar and decided to go ahead with it.

I take pleasure in announcing now that the Netherlands will organize a brief seminar on practical aspects of the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention in its early years. The seminar, under the title "OPCW, the First Five Years", will be held at The Hague on 8 and 9 May 1992.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

As to participation, Ambassadors or their deputies will be invited as well as a number of independent specialists on chemical weapons issues. All costs will be borne by the Netherlands Government. Further details on the seminar will be communicated in due time.

The seminar's agenda has not been entirely set as yet. The Netherlands delegation is, of course, receptive to any suggestions for the agenda. Our preliminary ideas centre on, inter alia, the following issues:

Which tasks should the OPCW perform immediately upon entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention, and which tasks can wait?

How should the OPCW be structured?

Which steps will be required to structure the OPCW, and in which order should these be carried out?

What are the implications, organizationally and otherwise, for the Preparatory Committee and the composition of its staff?

What kind of central laboratory or workshop is needed?

What are the data-handling requirements of the OPCW?

Financial questions.

No doubt, those topics will stimulate the participants in the seminar to engage in a lively and instructive brainstorming-type discussion, a discussion that could help set the stage for the future Preparatory Committee. After all, the PrepCom may already have to begin its work towards the end of this calendar year, or early in 1993. In short, the Netherlands delegation hopes that the seminar at The Hague will enlighten us as to the various institutional and practical tasks which probably will require our increasing attention during the months ahead.

As we prepare for the operation of the Convention on Chemical Weapons, allow me to address another related practical aspect. The negotiations show that the future organization will require a highly qualified technical staff, particularly for data-handling and inspection functions. Several delegations from developing countries have pointed out that it may be difficult to find sufficiently qualified personnel from the developing world to work in the new organization. As a result, the recruitment of inspectors and other technical personnel might develop a bias in favour of the industrialized States. It seems to us that this is a valid observation. Unbalanced recruitment patterns must indeed be prevented.

Some years ago, Finland launched a laudable and successful programme to train chemical analysts from developing countries as a means of preparing for the effective implementation of the CW convention. Just now, Germany has

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

announced an interesting additional training programme, aimed especially at clarifying the practical aspects of on-site inspections of CW stockpiles and chemical industrial plants. The German programme is intended for participants in the Finnish training sessions, and is subsequent to these. Apparently, some other States are also considering organizing training courses for future inspectors from developing countries.

The Netherlands has decided to add its own contribution to this commendable endeavour. In the second half of June 1992, we will organize a training programme for about 10 graduates in chemical sciences from developing countries. Since the programme is somewhat comparable to the German one, it seems more efficient to invite other graduates than those already involved in the next Finnish course.

A detailed letter inviting applications for the course will soon be sent to all delegations concerned, be they CD members or CD observers.

The intensive programme will include practical training in the use of protective gear, decontamination measures, sampling and transport of highly toxic chemicals, recognition of chemical munitions and, possibly, a kind of trial inspection in an industrial plant. All costs, including travel costs, will be borne by our Ministry of Development Cooperation. The course will be given by the Netherlands Chemical Defence Organization, the Prince Maurits Laboratory of the Netherlands Organization for Applied Scientific Research.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to support what Ambassador von Wagner just said about the long lead-times involved in the effective training of candidate inspectors. I would join his urgent appeal to all those countries which consider establishing training programmes not to wait any longer but to take action now.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Netherlands for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other representative wish to take the floor at this stage? I see none.

Before we adjourn this plenary meeting, I wish to inform you of some pending questions with which we will be dealing at our next plenary meeting tomorrow. As is the practice of the Conference, we shall take up tomorrow, for adoption, the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at our 610th plenary meeting and was circulated as document CD/1116. As I announced last week, we shall then formalize agreement on the organizational arrangements to be followed for agenda items 2 and 3, on which consensus was achieved during presidential consultations. I wish to inform you also that we should consider, tomorrow, another request from a non-member for participation in the work of the Conference. The relevant communication from Malta was circulated in the delegation's boxes late last week. Since, so far, that

(The President)

request seems to be acceptable, I hope that we can dispense with convening an informal meeting to review it. In any case, it will also be considered this afternoon at presidential consultations, where we can dispense with that requirement.

I have no other business to consider today and I intend now to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held tomorrow, 13 February, at 10 a.m.

The plenary meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.